NEWMAN AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS

BY

VOLTISA DEMIRAJ

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE INSTITUTE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

THESIS SUPERVISOR CADOC D. LEIGHTON

SEPTEMBER, 2001

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences.

Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan

Director of Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Cadoc D. Leighton

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Paul Latimer

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of History.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Aslı Çırakman

Examining Committee Member

Abstract

The nineteenth-century British intellectual, John Henry Newman in his short *History of the Turks in their Relation to Europe,* written just before the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1854, disclosed his attitude towards his country`s policy of waging a war in support of Turkey. Newman, regarding Russia as the protector of the Christians living under Ottoman rule, and the Ottoman Empire as a declining non-European power which did not merit to be counted part of Europe, opposed that war.

In his work, Newman, wishing to direct his countrymen`s attention to a matter so neglected, but fundamental to the solution of the Eastern Question, that is, to the issue of 'civilisation' among the Turks, showed, based on his own understanding of the notions of 'barbarism' and 'civilisation', that the Ottoman state and its society were uncivilised, barbarous and un-progressive. Therefore, this study dedicated to Newman`s thought and intellect, and his views and opinions with reference to the Turks, revealed that Newman did indeed favoured civilisation and progress, at least when he dealt with the history of the Turks and their empire. Thus, it offered a corrective to some unjust judgements of Newman. In drawing up the picture of the past and present state of the Turks, Newman was open to the Orientalist and secularist view of those nineteenth-century British writers that he selected to use.

Özet

19. yüzyıllın ünlü tarıh yazarı John Henry Newman, 1854'te Kırım Savaşı'nın hemen öncesinde kendı yazdığı kıtabında *The History of the Turks in their Relation to Europe,* dikkatleri ülkesinin uyguladığı politikasının üzerinde çekti. Bu savaş sırasında bilindiği gibi İngiltere Türkiye'nin tarafını tuttu. Newman bu savaşa karşı çıkıyordu çünkü, Rusya Osmanlı İmparatorluğun sömürgesı altında yaşayan tüm Kristyan halklarının bi nevi koruyucusuydu ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Avrupa'ya ait olmayan, düşüş trendinde olan bir devletti. Eserinde, Newman'ın birincil hedefi İngiliz kamuoyun dikkatini Turkiye'nin geri kalmasına çekmekti (bu unsur Doğu Sorunu için çok büyük bir onem taşıyordu). O "barbar" ve "medeniyet" unsurlarını analize ederek, Türk toplumunun geride kalmış, çağadaş olmayan ve ilerleyememiş bir toplum olarak göstermeye çalıştı. Bu etüd, Newman'ın Türkler hakkında içerdiği düşünceler ve değerlendirmelerinin yanlışlarını analize ediyor ve gösteriyor ki gerçekte Newman "medeniyet" ve "gelişme" unsurlarını destekliyor, en azından Türk Tarihini ve Devletini analize ederken. Aynı zamanda bu etüd gösteriyor ki bu kitabı yazarken, Newman bazı 19. yüzyıllın İngiliz yazarlarından etkilendi ve onların öne sürdükleri doğuya yönelik düşünceleri kendi kitabında kullandı.

Table of Contents

I N T R O D U C T I O N

The nineteenth-century British intellectual, John Henry Newman always claimed that he was an "occasional" writer. After reviewing the whole body of his work, he concluded that almost the only work written for its own sake and not in consequence of a specific 'call' was *A Grammar of Assent*.[1] His lectures on the *History of the Turks in their Relation to Europe* were the result of a specific 'call.' They were the result of the coming Crimean War. His country was preparing to participate in a European war, on which the fate of the Ottoman Empire depended. His country supported Muslim Turkey against Christian Russia. Newman, regarding Russia as the protector of the Christians living under Ottoman rule, opposed his country`s policy of waging a worthless war in support of Turkey. To reveal why Newman opposed the Crimean War and why Newman supported Russia and not Turkey, as his country did, is the aim of this study.

To understand Newman`s attitude to that war, it is necessary first, to grasp and reveal Newman`s intellectual background, the philosophy and the nature of his mind and above all, the peculiarities of his thought. It is the study of Newman`s thought and intellect that the first chapter of the thesis will explore. In order to understand Newman`s thought, we need, in truth, to look at its evolution from his earliest years up to when he set out to write his survey of the history of the Turks. The influences under which his mind developed and matured will be analysed. His enduring struggle against liberalism – "the

---

[1] J. M. Cameron, *John Henry Newman* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1963), pp. 7-8.

anti-dogmatic principle and its developments" and his pious attempts to enforce dogma as the essence of religion are discussed at some length.

A short introduction to the international background of the Crimean War and British opinion among politicians and the wider public towards that war is given in the second chapter. Newman`s attitude towards the war is disclosed by his writings on the Turks and their empire. Thus, Newman and his sketch of Turkish history is the theme of the third chapter. An overview to his narrative of the Turkish history and society is given, while Newman`s thought and views on the Turks and their empire are analysed. Special space is given to Newman`s understanding of the notions of 'barbarism' and 'civilisation' with reference to the Ottoman Turks. It was on the basis of his reflection on this that he constructed their history, as the history of a "barbarous" and "uncivilised" people, who as such did not merit to be counted part of Europe. Because Newman is thought to have been very hostile to progress and indifferent to civilisation, the basic question, 'To what extent Newman valued civilisation?,' will be kept in focus.

In drawing up the picture of the past and present state of the Turks, Newman availed himself of the vast information supplied by many nineteenth-century writers and travellers. The state and character of those sources, together with their views and opinions, as sources which influenced and strengthened Newman`s views, are analysed in the fourth chapter. A source-oriented approach is necessary to understand the extent of the knowledge, and then the attitudes and views, which nineteenth-century Britons possessed about the Turks and their empire, and to understand to what extent Newman's thought was compatible with that information and those opinions.

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF NEWMAN`S MIND

In England, the early nineteenth century saw a religious revival which was not a specifically British phenomenon, but part of a wider development. It was the age, as John Neale pointed out, when religion provided the same kind of ideological fervour that communism, fascism and liberalism provided in the early twentieth century.[1] In 1815, this religious revival was already under way, exemplified both by the Evangelical movement within the Church of England and by an expansion and re-invigoration of the Nonconformist Protestant sects. Though Evangelical language and ideas increasingly dominated English society, even after its essential religious power had begun to fade, Evangelicalism was not the only influential religious movement of the era. The year 1833 marks the beginning of the "Catholic Revival" or Anglo-Catholic movement within the Church of England, as Reed [2] and some historians define that movement. In historiography it is widely known as the *Oxford Movement*.

In the early nineteenth century, everyone confessed England to be Christian and nearly everyone wanted to keep it Christian or make it more Christian. In England, Christianity had been represented by an established Church that for most of the people meant the establishment of the Church by the State. Thus, essential to

---

[1] John Neale, *The Age of Catherine de Medici* (London, 1951), p. 63
[2] John Shelton Reed, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Nashville & London: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1996), p. xxi

the form of the English Church, as established by Parliament, was the universal jurisdiction of the Crown. The Church was grafted upon the State, while the State would remain the master. This system continued to work well until the time when Liberalism and liberal ideas, spreading from the French Revolution, influenced the state and were identified as hostile to the Church. The Church was now perceived as a bastion under assault.

At the time of the French Revolution, Britain was a conservative country where ideas of protecting and maintaining the established aristocratic order prevailed. Society and intellectuals as well, had, for centuries, accepted the old order's political culture and the conservative tradition, which they were supporting and protecting even in the early nineteenth century, a century, which would open the way to Liberalism. But, in the nineteenth-century the liberal ideology and ideas not only raised questions about the legitimacy of the *ancien regime* and threatened the entire order of Europe, but in England, it also brought the Church to feel itself under threat. This was widely expressed by the intellectual and religious public. So, the "establishment of the Church of England is now in serious peril," wrote the *Times* on October 1832. "The Church, as it now stands, no human power can save,"[3] wrote Dr. Arnold in 1832. Richard Whately thought it difficult to "preserve the Establishment from utter overthrow." Alexander Knox, a far-seeing Irish writer, said: "The old High Church race is worn out."[4] Thus, a part of the public opinion of 1833 and especially the religious public,

---

[3] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part 1:1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992), p. 47

[4] William Barry, *The Oxford Movement (1833-1845*), transcribed by A. Waterman at the web page http:/www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 3

saw in the liberal ideas coming from the French Revolution fresh symptoms of an un-Christian movement.

The French Revolution had shown how a people could desert the religion of their fathers. Was it possible that this could happen in Britain, it was asked? Britain, in fact, was really moving in that direction. With the Whigs in government pledged to reform in State and Church, and the Church notoriously riddled with abuses, certainly ecclesiastical reform seemed likely to come next after parliamentary reform. The Church seemed to be running into danger, at least, as the High Churchmen and even a part of the Evangelicals came to see it. The vital question was, John Henry Newman said, how were they to keep the Church from being liberalised? [5] Thus, the course of political events, the reform crisis of the 1830s, the spread of the explosive ideas of the French Revolution and the "anomalous and singular position," as Dean Church allowed,[6] held by the Establishment in England inspired a whole intellectual counter-revolution opposed to the liberal spirit of the age, to the necessary transformation of the old traditional order and the breach of historical continuity. It was the famous Oxford Movement of 1833.

At Oxford, a group of Anglican academics and clergymen were increasingly unhappy with the lack of seriousness with which the Establishment regarded its religious duties, with its lethargy and negligence in the Church, with the failure to appreciate the Catholic heritage of the Church, in particular the historical and

---

[5] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of his Religious Opinions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 39
[6] William Barry, *The Oxford Movement* (1833-1845), p. 1

theological insights held before the Reformation and with the Church of England`s Erastianism - the willingness to subordinate the legitimate claims and prerogatives of the Church to the requirements of state policy. John Henry Newman, John Keble and Hurrell Froude were the well-known leaders of that "secret papist school of divinity in Oxford," [7] known also as "The Tractarian Movement." The Tractarian Movement originated with the *Tracts for the Times* which gave its familiar name to the movement, that is, with Newman who, since his return from his Mediterranean travels, was "revealing himself as the master strategist" [8] of the movement.

John Henry Newman was born in the city of London on February 21, 1801. He was the eldest son of an Anglican father, John Newman and an evangelical Anglican mother, Jemima Foudrinier. She was a moderate Calvinist and taught her children to read and love Scott, Romaine, Newton, Milner and other thinkers of that school. Newman himself recorded that he "was brought up from a child to take great delight in reading the Bible." [9] This was not only a tradition among English people, but it was also the way in which the religion of the Bible was understood and practised by Evangelical Protestants of England. They had a vivid sense of God`s providence in the history of the world and they liked their young to be taught to read their Bibles and to know well their Biblical histories.

When he was a child Newman`s mind "ran on unknown influences," but, as he

---

[7] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, *Part 1: 1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992), p. 168
[8] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 81
[9] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a history of his religious opinions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 15

recorded "I had no formed religious convictions till I was fifteen."[10] At that age Newman underwent a spiritual conversion at Ealing School, which, as he saw it, would set him on the road to perfection.

Soon he "fell under the influences of a definite Creed, and received into my intellect impressions of dogma which, through God`s mercy have never been effaced or obscured."[11] The influences Newman talks about were the doctrine of final perseverance which "had some influence on my opinions" and which he held "till the age of twenty-one"[12] and, other teachings of the writers like Thomas Scott, Milner and Newton who were brought into his hands by one of his classics masters. From these "he received deep religious impressions… which were to him the beginning of a new life."[13]

From the writings of Thomas Scott, "to whom humanly speaking, I almost owe my soul," Newman learned the doctrine of Trinity, while Milner`s *Church History* and Newton`s work on apocalyptic introduced him to the ancient fathers and convinced him that the Pope was the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John, convictions which he retained up to the year 1843. It was these influences, as he himself narrates, which would "plant in me the seeds of an intellectual inconsistency

---

[10] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a history of his religious opinions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 16,15
[11] Ibid., p. 17
[12] *Ibid.*
[13] John Henry Newman, *Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Henry Tristram (London and New York, 1956), p. 29

which disabled me for a long course of years."[14]

Always thoughtful, shy and affectionate, Newman was blessed with the rare combination of the keenest intellect and a generous heart. When he went up to Trinity College, Oxford, in December 1816, his teachers were delighted with a pupil of such capability and who showed so much promise. Soon, the efforts of such an excellent and hard-working student became evident when Newman was elected a fellow of Oriel in 1822, then the first in reputation and intellect among the Oxford Colleges. Newman ever felt this to be "the turning point in his life, and of all days most memorable."[15] Ordained into the Anglican Church, Newman soon had pastoral duties as well as scholarly ones. For two years as a deacon, he did parish work among the poor at St. Clement`s, near Oxford.

He fell also under the influence of Richard Whately who, being the clearest-headed man Newman knew "opened my mind, and taught me to think and to use my reason"[16] and who, in 1825, made Newman his vice-principal at St. Mary`s hall, from the pulpit of which he gained his wide reputation as a great preacher. Whately stimulated him by discussion and taught him the notion of Christianity as a social and sovereign organism distinct from the State. During his parochial duties in Oxford, Newman was also thrown into Edward Hawkins`s company, who "was the first who taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements"[17] and

---

[14] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp. 19-20
[15] John Henry Newman, *Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Henry Tristam (London and New York, 1956), p. 63
[16] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford:Clarendon Press*, 1990),* p. 23
[17] Ibid., p. 21

who directed his mind towards the Catholic doctrines of tradition and Baptismal regeneration.

Yet another influence that was to have an important bearing on his writings and helped him place "his doctrinal views on a broad philosophical basis"[18] was Joseph Butler`s *Analogy of Religion* (1736). He imbued in Newman the idea of analogy between the system of nature and the system of revelation, which he later used in some of his most famous writings. Thus, it was during those early years at Oriel College, that Newman, having been in contact with and under the influence of different scholars and leading figures like Capleston, Whately, John Davison, Hawkins and Thomas Arnold, learned much through academic and intellectual discussions. During this time, Newman began also to study early Church history and the teachings of the Fathers. He discovered many doctrines taught in the ancient church, especially the sacramental system and apostolic succession, which as he came to conclude later, had largely been abandoned by many Anglicans.

Thus, as we may easily understand by Newman's narrative in his *Apologia*, his early religious opinions were constructed under different philosophical influences and sources, which led him to formulate his personal philosophy of mind. While he was impressed and attracted, at this formative period, both to the Classics and the ancient Fathers, his ideas and mind developed under principles and doctrines which were Anglican and Greek, and not Roman.

---

[18] John Henry Newman, *Autobiographical Writings*, ed. Henry Tristram (London and New York, 1956), p. 78

"Had it not been for his love of the patristic writings," Ker points out "he would no doubt have embraced a cold Arminian doctrine, which was the characteristic aspect, both of the high and dry Anglicans of that day and of the Oriel divines."[19] Thus, there is no denying that many influences converged to bring him to his frame of mind.

But, as one writer says, the story really begins in 1826 when Newman came into touch with Richard Hurrell Froude and through him, with the other early Tractarians. Furthermore, it was really at this time that Newman gained his knowledge of certain Catholic truths from various sources. The "bright and beautiful" Froude, as Newman described him, was not only the connecting link between Keble and Newman, but his influence on Newman`s development was of far greater significance than Newman himself could realise. His friendship, says Barry, proved to be the one thing needful to a temper which always leaned on its associates and which absorbed ideas with the vivacity of genius.[20] Froude was "the one thing needful," at the right moment, for he taught Newman "to look with admiration towards the Church of Rome, and in the same degree to dislike the Reformation." "He fixed deep in me," Newman continued, "the idea of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and he led me gradually to believe in the Real Presence."[21] His thoughts and opinions really "arrested and influenced" Newman, even when they did not gain his assent. It was by means of

---

[19] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 23

[20] William Barry, *The Oxford Movement* (1833-1845) at the web page http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 3

[21] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 35

his association and friendship with Froude and John Keble, the leading fellow of Oriel, that Newman not only came in contact with Roman Catholicism, but also began to see the need of the Anglican Church for an enthusiastic movement which would render it aware of its vanished glories.

Thus, with a mission in his mind and the strong presentiment "I have a work to do in England,"[22] Newman returned from his travels in the south of Europe to Oxford. The following Sunday, July 14th, Mr. Keble preached the Assize Sermon in the University Pulpit. It was published under the title of *National Apostacy*. "I have ever considered and kept the day, as the start of the religious movement of 1833,"[23] Newman stated, regarding this event as the beginning of that reaction whose simple aim was to oppose and resist "the specific danger which at that time was threatening the religion of the nation and its Church,"[24] that is, the liberal ideology of his time. Soon, the *Tracts for the Times*, which Newman began "out of his own head" and the *British Magazine,* which was the organ of resistance to Whig Church reform, became the principle means of promoting their doctrinal and moral concerns about the Church reform.

Keble, Froude and Newman and their Tractarian followers were not opposed to reform as such, nor were they admirers of the existing state of the Established Church. They could not reconcile themselves with the lethargy and negligence that characterised the Church; with weaknesses and doctrinal laxity; with

---

[22] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 43
[23] Ibid., p. 43
[24] Ibid., p. 44

the political trends which threatened the Church`s status as a national institution and with what they called "liberalism" - "the anti-dogmatic principle and its developments"[25] - as Newman explains. In fact, the entire priestly career of Newman, as he narrated, was nothing else but one long battle against what he called the "great mischief" of liberalism. Newman's long battle was directed against the political liberalism of his own time, that is, the state interference with religion, and the state willingness to subordinate the legitimate claims of the Church to the requirements of its policy. He couldn't reconcile himself with the fact that the debate on Church reform was a political one neglecting the spiritual and doctrinal issues of the Church. He was sure that the liberal spirit of the age, which was trying to place the authority of the Church within the powers of the State, would bring about the breaking up of ancient institutions and the disestablishment of the Church. Because he believed that the constitution of the Church was of divine origin, and that it was not within the powers of the State, Newman resisted political liberalism.

It was not only political liberalism against which Newman was fighting. Another aspect of that liberal spirit of the nineteenth century was the religious liberalism, which was driving the world in the direction of unbelief. Both, political and religious liberalism, in fact, came from the same belief in individualistic reason, the main characteristic and the central belief of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, which saw reason as supreme in all departments of intellectual inquiry. Thus, it was the exaltation of individualistic reason, which was regarded as the

---

[25] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 54

supreme and only judge of truth, on matters of religion, that Newman was opposing with all his energies and which earns him a place among those great thinkers who opposed and revolted against the Age of Reason, as the Enlightenment came to be called.

Thus, for Newman, religious liberalism, which meant that all religious faith was to be tested by reason, was dangerous and therefore must be resisted. Because reason alone was incapable of testing religious truth, therefore the idea of making private judgements on religious matters and the right of the individual to treat his interpretations as authoritative was an error, a "great apostasia,"[26] as Newman styled it in his Biglietto Speech delivered on May 1879 on the occasion of being elevated by the Pope to membership of the College of Cardinals. In fact, Newman did not disagree with the view that religious tenets must be reasonable. He objected to the fact that reason alone validated belief, which he considered an absurdity. For him, conscience did more for truth than reason whose tendency "is towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion."[27] He had the conviction and believed that natural reason could not determine antecedently what a revelation would look like, nor what would be its credentials. Revelation itself was an instrument of knowledge and action. It would be recognized as coming from God, by those, who followed their conscience.[28] Thus, with this view in mind, against free-thought, and speculative and anarchic

---

[26] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 56

[27] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p.218

[28] Rik Achten, *First Principles and our Way to Faith: A Fundamental-Theological Study of John Henry Newman's Notion of First Principles* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), p.255

private judgement, Newman wanted to justify order and authority in Church by calling for Christianity, as a sacred fact, a revelation from on high and from a supernatural power.

Thus, viewing liberalism in the light of these two aspects, political and religious, Newman understood that the liberalism of his own days, as a spirit, which tended to overthrow doctrine, was carrying his country and the modern world against faith, against Catholic truth. Therefore he directed all his efforts to resisting it. For him,

> liberalism in religion is the doctrine that there is no positive truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another, and this is the teaching which is gaining substance and force daily… It teaches that all are to be tolerated, for all are matters of opinion. Revealed religion is not a truth, but a sentiment and a taste… Men may go to Protestant Churches and to Catholic, may get good from both and belong to neither…

Then, he added to that explanation by stating:

> By Liberalism I mean false liberty of thought, or the exercise of thought upon matters, in which from the constitution of the human mind, thought cannot be brought to any successful issue, and therefore is out of place…Liberalism then is the mistake of subjecting to human judgement those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it. [29]

Thus, Newman saw and considered the liberalism of his age as the chief enemy of religious truth, and the liberals as trying to destroy the Church. To oppose all these and to resist Church reform, Newman decided to undertake a relentless war against the 'liberalism' of the day and for a High Church defence of episcopacy and apostolic

---

[29] Kenneth D. Whitehead, *Newman against Liberalism* at the web page: http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/Dossier/jan98/liberal.html

government. He felt and made it his and the Tractarians' duty to revive the Church of England and to enforce Christian truth by appealing to its apostolic authority and its Catholic heritage, to the ancient fathers of undivided Christendom. For, as Newman wrote in his opening tract addressed to the clergy: "I fear, we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built, our Apostolic descent"[30]

Newman really understood that "there was need of a second Reformation,"[31] a second but a catholic Reformation which should aim at the restoration of the primitive Church in England. That ancient religion, Newman believed, "which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church and which was attested in the Anglican Formularies and by the Anglican divines… had well-nigh faded out of the land, through the political changes of the last 150 years, and it must be restored."[32] Thus, it is obvious that Newman, at this stage, was satisfied with the identity of the seventeenth-century 'Caroline divines,' because he believed that the dogmatic principle and the teachings of the early Christian Fathers were alive in them. But, this was not true for the Anglican Church of his own time, which through political changes, and influenced by the liberal tendencies of the Reformation period, had come to a stage of dogmatic decadence. The Anglican teachings had moved far from holding to its Apostolic and Catholic tradition. This is why Newman called for "a return not to the sixteenth-century, but to the seventeenth,"[33] a return to the doctrines of the old

---

[30] William Barry, The Oxford Movement (1833-1845), web page http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 4

[31] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 40

[32] Ibid., p. 50

[33] Ibid.

high Anglican Fathers, which were better kept alive by the 'Caroline divines' of the seventeenth century.

To fulfil that dream, the leaders of the movement sought to recall the Church of England to the dogmatic Catholicism, which, they believed, was implicit in the Book of Common Prayer and was the doctrine taught by the Fathers of the early Church. Thus, it is clear that the Tractarians believed that the Church of England was not a creation of the sixteenth century, but was the ancient Catholic Church pruned of the Bishop of Rome. They held, as the 'Caroline divines' did in the seventeenth century, that Christian antiquity, that is, the Church of the first centuries, provided a criterion of orthodoxy.

Thus, with this vision in their minds, Newman's and the Tractarians`s object was to place emphasis on the apostolic nature of Church government and on divine rather than parliamentary authority. This was to be done "by strengthening the English Church as the home of dogmatic religion; by imparting intellectual depth to its traditional theology and spiritual life to its institutions; by strengthening and renewing the almost broken links which bound the Church of England to the Church Catholic of the great ages – the Church of Augustine and Athanasius." [34]

During the years 1834-1837, Newman came to develop his theory of the *Via Media,* and to affirm the Church`s status as "a receding from extremes," [35] a middle ground between Roman Catholicism`s unfounded emphasis on authority and

---

[34] Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Newman*, vol.1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1912) at http://www.newmanreader.org/biography/ward/volume1/chapter1.html, p.2

[35] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 70

infallibility and the Dissenters` equally unfounded emphasis upon spiritual liberty and private judgement. It was expressed in his work, *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, with which, as Ker observes, "the theology of the Church, which Newman was painfully to develop during the next forty years, begins and ends."[36] In fact, it was also an absolute necessity for them, because people were suspecting that the Tracts and the writings of the Fathers would lead them to become Catholics. It became therefore necessary for them to define with precision the relation in which they stood to the Church of Rome. The English Church, Newman maintained, lay between the Reformers and the Romanists. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematised as heresies the peculiar tenets of the Reformation, whether of Calvin or Luther, and it could not but protest against Roman corruptions. Thus, in his book, Newman condemned Rome and propounded the appeal to undivided Christianity. But, as Newman made clear, the actual Protestant practise of the English Church did not agree with its Catholic theory and he felt that his and the Movement`s principal duty was to bring the practise of the Church of England to agree with its theory, which was that of the ancient Fathers of undivided Christendom. This was what Newman and his Tractarian friends wanted to revive in the Church of England.

In fact, since his visit to the city of Rome in 1832, Newman felt his heart drawn by Roman antiquities and it was antiquity, which made him more sensitive to the grandeur of the past. As he himself showed in the *Apologia,* it was the teaching of

---

[36] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 139

antiquity that constituted one of the most important sources of his thought and convictions on the Church and its doctrine. "From 1832," Pattison points out, "the Arian controversy was the fixed intellectual point around which the constellation of Newman`s opinions revolved."[37] In fact, Newman`s consideration of Antiquity as "the true exponent of the doctrines of Christianity and the basis of the Church of England"[38] appeared after 1830 when he set about to read and write on early Church history. The more he read, the more he was attracted by the ancient Fathers' teachings, which "magnificent in themselves, came like music to my inward ear."[39] It was those teachings, which made Newman understand that "the exterior world, physical and historical, was but the manifestation, to our senses, of realities greater than itself. Nature was a parable: Scripture was an allegory: pagan literature, philosophy and mythology, properly understood were but a preparation for the Gospel."[40] From these teachings Newman received the strong conviction of supernatural intervention in our everyday life. This constituted the doctrine of the Economy of the Visible World. Thus, inspired by those teachings of Antiquity and with the aim of "attempting to defend the work of men indefinitely above me (the primitive Fathers), which is now assailed,"[41] Newman produced his work, wholly pro-Alexandrian and anti-Antioch, *The Arians of the Fourth Century.*

---

[37] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 102
[38] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), pp 35-36
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain, vol. ii (Oxford, 1978-84), p. 43

In this work, Newman gave also full expression of his confidence that dogma was the backbone of religion, and it was this, which he was always to assert with persistency and the greatest energy. He devoted his intellectual depth to the principle of dogma, for he believed that dogma was of the very essence to Revelation, that it was essential in order to display and safeguard the Revelation. He, himself, as a believer in the revealed truth, wrote in his *Apologia* that "from the age of fifteen, dogma has been the fundamental principle of my religion; I know no other religion; I cannot enter into the idea of any other sort of religion; religion, as a mere sentiment, is to me a dream and a mockery."[42] As Newman showed, he believed that the Church had to frame its experience in dogmas because only so could the experience of the Church be handed from one generation to another. Being a principle so essential of his religion, Newman dedicated the best of his powers to this, and fought with his strongest energies the spirit of liberalism in religion, which he conceived, as the "anti-dogmatic principle and its development." For he understood that his stress upon the dogmatic authority of the Church was felt to be a much-needed emphasis in a new liberal age. He believed that only the Church speaking dogmatically could preserve the dogmatic authority of truth.

Furthermore, Newman had the conviction that "no civilisation could endure which failed to enforce Christian dogma" and "the dogmas are only effective where the means exist to make belief and action conform to dogma." [43] The same could

---

[42] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990),* p. 54
[43] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 182-183

be said related to belief. For him, no civilised culture could exist without any true belief. A culture built on false belief was not a civilised one. Only true belief could lead a culture towards civilisation. The civilisation that applied true belief, acted according to it and that for whom "supernatural truth is its sovereign law,"[44] was the model of civilisation. In fact, Newman constructed and developed his own theory of belief, which asserted the existence of divine truth, and explained human life as the relation of belief to this truth. At the core of this theory stood the assertion that human life was determined by its belief. It was belief that determined the actions of individuals. The human mind "does act believingly," therefore belief determined its fate. Thus, it was belief that shaped human history.[45]

The contention that right belief and dogma leads a culture towards civilisation marked the uniqueness in Newman's thought. But, though he believed that there was no civilisation without dogma and right belief, a conviction, which Newman formed as a consequence of his Christian orthodoxy, in the next chapter we will see how Newman renounced this conviction, or rather say, did not apply it in his writings on the history of the Turks.

While reading and studying the history of the ancient Fathers, Newman came to understand the difference that existed between the 'divided and threatened' Church of England and 'that fresh vigorous Power' of the first centuries, though not only that.

---

[44] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol.1, (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p.165

[45] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), pp. 180, 198,102

It was the study of the Arian controversy and of the Monophysites he undertook, which "unlocked the mysteries of his own mind and of the corrupt civilisation around him"[46] and raised doubts about the validity of his *Via Media*. Moreover, as he himself shows in his *Apologia*, while he was engaged with some reading and writing in the summer of 1841 "the ghost had come a second time."[47] Once again, Antiquity disturbed his mind, but this time it led him definitively toward Rome. During those patristic studies, which became the order of the day, he came to perceive that "in the history of Arianism, the pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and that Rome now was what it was then. The truth lay, not with the *Via Media*, but with what was called 'the extreme party'." [48] Thus, he understood that while the Church of England itself had been unfaithful to that very Catholic tradition which he was rescuing and restoring, Rome was indeed ancient Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople. He was convinced by now that the Roman Catholic Church had held to much original Christian doctrine that the Protestants had abandoned. So, it was the ancient history of the Church, it was Antiquity that brought him to think and believe that:

> the drama of religion, and the combat of truth and error, were ever one and the same. The principles and proceedings of the Church now, were those of the Church then; the principles and proceedings of the heretics then, were those of Protestants now; …there was an awful similitude…between the dead records of the past, and the feverish chronicle of the present. The shadow of the fifth century was on the sixteenth. It was like a spirit rising from the troubled waters of the world, with the shape and lineaments of the new. [49]

---

[46] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 103
[47] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 130
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid., p. 108

Newman expressed his new views in *Tract Ninety* published on February 21st, 1841, in which he argued that the Thirty-Nine Articles, the doctrinal statement of the Church of England "do not oppose Catholic teaching, they but partially oppose Roman dogma; they for the most part oppose the dominant errors of Rome."[50] The *Tract* was intended to keep stragglers from Rome by distinguishing the "ultimate points of contrariety between the Romans and Anglican creeds, and to make them as few as possible."[51] But Newman had miscalculated and above all he was misunderstood. He had drifted so far that he had lost sight of the ever-enduring Protestantism, which to that day, was the bulwark of the national feeling against Rome. "To a mind constituted like Newman's," says Barry, "imbued with Ignatian ideas of episcopacy and unwilling to perceive that they did not avail in the English Establishment, this was an ex-cathedra judgement against him."[52] A furious and widespread agitation broke out in consequence. Newman was denounced as a traitor and as a supporter of Catholicism and his motive was declared to be treason. The *Apologia* described it like this:

> in every part of the country, and every class of society, through every organ and opportunity of opinion, in newspapers, in periodicals, at meetings, in pulpits, at dinner-tables, in coffee-rooms, in railway-carriages, I was denounced as a traitor who had laid his train, and was detected in the very act of firing it against the time-honoured Establishment."[53]

---

[50] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 79
[51] Ibid.
[52] William Barry, The Oxford Movement (1833-1845), web page http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 5
[53] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 88

The Tract was censured and condemned by bishops and the Oxford authorities, which was a severe blow not only to Newman, but to the Movement as well. His place in the Movement was gone and, as Chadwick observes, "the battle over *Tract Ninety* ended Newman`s usefulness to the Church of England."[54] Badly shaken by the negative reaction to *Tract Ninety*, Newman reached a crisis: if the Anglican Church he belonged to was not a branch of the Catholic Church, he knew he could not remain in it. Thus, Newman gradually withdrew from public life. Between July 1841 and September 1843, he left the *British Critic*, moved from Oxford to a semi-monastic community at Littlemore, retracted the anti-Catholic statements he had published, and resigned his position at St. Mary`s. As he himself noted, "from the end of the 1841, I was on my death-bed, as regards my membership with the Anglican Church."[55]

The reaction against *Tract Ninety* and the consequences it had for Newman, constituted, one of the "three blows which broke"[56] him in summer of 1841. But seen more closely those 'blows' led him towards a gradual inward movement of his mind, towards a shift of his intellectual ground and a constant change of his religious opinions, change which came gradually through his reflections on the Anglican Church.

Thus, when the Oxford Movement began, Newman believed that the Church of England had practically failed in reaching and maintaining its Catholic heritage and,

---

[54] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, *Part 1: 1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992), p.188
[55] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 137
[56] Ibid., p. 130

it shamefully had come to a point of even neglecting its duties as a 'guardian of morality' and a 'teacher of orthodoxy.' Thus, he put all his efforts forth to bring the practise of the Church of England to agree with its traditional theory. But now, after the hard years of his religious development and religious acknowledgment, he even thought it wrong in theory. He came to believe that the Established Church "never represented a doctrine at all…, never had an intellectual basis" and perhaps it has "been but a name, or a department of State."[57]

This suspicion became stronger in Newman`s mind after the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric which aimed at an alliance between England and Protestant Prussia, by which an Anglican Bishop was appointed at Jerusalem. In fact, this plan was part of British and German policy in the Middle East and especially in Turkey. As Turkey was gradually collapsing, the powers began to protect their interests for the future. As Russia displayed its intentions to protect the Orthodox, and France the Roman Catholics, so Britain and Prussia decided to protect the Protestants. Moreover, Newman suspected that "the Bishop was intended to make converts from the orthodox Greeks and schismatical Oriental bodies, by means of the influence of England."[58]

This, for Newman, was another blow, which completely destroyed his faith in the Anglican Church. Because he not only "had a horror of continental Protestants," as Chadwick [59] points out, but he also could not reconcile himself to that Church which

---

[57] William Barry, The Oxford Movement (1833-1845), web page http://www.newadvent.org/ pp. 4-5
[58] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 133
[59] Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992), p. 192

it actually was courting an intercommunion with Protestant Prussia and the heresy of the "was not only forbidding any sympathy or concurrence with the Church of Rome, but Orientals."[60] Such acts, as removing the Church from her established grounds and tending to her disorganization, irritated Newman and led him even to suspect that "since the sixteenth century the Anglican Church had never been a Church all along."[61] Thus, viewing every thing in the light of his own ideas, disillusionment was great and deep.

Disillusioned by his Church, Newman set about to demonstrate how the doctrines of the Catholic Church were the inevitable result of development through the centuries. He applied all his intellect to distinguish between genuine developments on the one hand and mere change or corruption of the Catholic Church on the other. And by deep studies he came to explain the apparent variations of dogma on a theory of evolution, which for many of his contemporaries and of the modern historians, in many ways showed the influence of nineteenth-century historicism. During these studies of 1844-1845, the result of which was his work *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, Newman had convinced himself of the truth of the Catholic Church. This work, in its theological and philosophical side, gave Newman the name of "the originator of the theory of development in dogma"[62] and the man who "inaugurated the study of evolution."[63]

---

[60] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 133
[61] Ibid., p. 133
[62] Wilfrid Ward, The Life of John Henry Newman, vol. 1 (Longmans, Greed & Co., 1912), at web page: http://www.newmanreader.org/biography/ward/volume1/chapter1/html, p. 1
[63] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 194

Thus, as Newman saw and understood it the Anglican Church was wrong both in its practise and theory and as he was becoming more and more convinced that the Roman Catholic Church was "formally in the right; then, …no valid reason could be assigned for continuing in the Anglican, and again …no valid objections could be taken to joining the Roman."[64] Thus, after a long interior struggle and constant reflection on Catholicism and the Church of England, Newman was received into the Catholic Church on October 9, 1845.

The retirement of Newman and his conversion in 1845 marked the climax of his life, after which "of course I have no further history of my religious opinions to relate," in the sense that "I have had no variations to record, and have had no anxiety of heart whatever." [65] His conversion, although long in prospect, was a heavy blow to the Church of England. It not only irritated and distressed his countrymen and the disciples he had won and who did not forgive him until many years had gone by, but it also left the Oxford Movement headless and caused to it almost a disaster. But, above all, his conversion showed that Newman at length freely assented to what he conceived to be eternal truth, "the One true Fold of the Redeemer," as he himself put it, far from considering that act as somehow un-English, as it came to be perceived or prejudiced by some English minds. He looked upon it as fulfilling the highest

---

[64] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 133
[65] Ibid., p. 214

aspirations of his race; for he, … was English, and therefore "born free." [66]

Newman's conversion, apart from being "a great revolution of mind,"[67] was also his public profession as a leading reactionary to the liberal current of the nineteenth-century English thought. Leaving painfully Littlemore where "a happy time indeed I have had there, happy to look back on …without an evil conscience," [68] Newman in 1846 proceeded to Rome and was there ordained by Cardinal Fransoni. "We see him beginning his new life with a profound sense that he had come to the promised land" Ward [69] recorded. With his own vision of Catholicism as a real religion, an institution continuous with the past and yet with a life ever developing and challenging the present, Newman began, enthusiastically "a regular education" where he wanted "to be strictly under obedience and discipline for a time." [70]

While in Rome, he became acquainted with the life and writings of St. Philip Neri and in 1847 the pope approved of his scheme for establishing in England the Oratory of St. Philip Neri of which Newman was the head. So, he came back to England and worked for setting up the first Oratorian Congregation of England and the Oratory School in Birmingham, where Newman would dwell, with occasional

---

[66] Marvin R. O'Connell, *Freedom and Conversion: The English Experience* in Journal of Texas Catholic History and Culture, 1993 in the web page: http://www.history.swt.edu/CSW/volume4/V4Oconnell.htm , p.3

[67] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 90

[68] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 319

[69] Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Newman,* vol. 1 (Longmans, Green & Co., 1912), web page: http://www.newmanreader.org/biography/ward/volume1/chapter1.html, p. 3

[70] *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain, vol. xi, (London, 1961-72), pp. 151-152

exceptions, for the rest of his life. He continued to preach and to write. A series of Sunday evening sermons, and several series of lectures drew great crowds of disciples and he affected many conversions.

As a Catholic and a scholar, he continued to write on issues that disturbed his mind. In 1848, he produced his first novel, *Loss and Gain: The Story of a Convert,* intended to be, as he himself stated in it, "a description of …the course of thought and state of mind" of a particular convert to Catholicism and an underlying of the "first principles" that underpin explicit assent to Catholic doctrine.[71] In 1850, he delivered at the London Oratory his *Lectures on Certain Difficulties felt by Anglicans in submitting to the Catholic Church,* intended to remove the difficulties of Anglo-Catholics. Thus, apart from Newman's genius, which "bloomed out with a force and freedom such as it never displayed in the Anglican Communion," [72] there was no change of thought and opinion in Newman's writings as a Catholic. He still continued to believe and gradually to strengthen his belief that in the Catholic Church only, there was the one hope for withstanding a movement towards unbelief, which threatened to be the greatest danger of the modern world.

After his conversion, Newman so often suffered much from misunderstandings, suspicions and the opposition of some ecclesiastical authorities, which resulted in the abortion of his three great projects to which he was called by his

---

[71] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 332

[72] William Barry, *The Oxford Movement (1833-1845)*, web page http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 6

ecclesiastical superiors – the foundation of the Catholic University in Dublin, a new translation of the Bible and the establishment of a branch of the Oratory in Oxford, projects which aimed at serving both religion and culture. In 1851, Newman was invited to be the first Rector of a Catholic University to be established in Dublin and to deliver some lectures on education, whose general theme would be "the great subject of the connection of religion with literature and science" [73] out of which came his classic book, *The Idea of a University*. This successful book, which still remains a grand and enduring vision of education, influenced Britain and through her the educational systems of many other countries. As Newman was busy at that time with the promotion and protection of the English educational system, in 1853 he was asked to deliver a course of lectures at the opening ceremony of the recently founded Catholic Institute in Liverpool. Though he refused on the ground of his bad health, he managed to deliver six lectures as a contribution to Catholic education, later published under the title, *Lectures on the History of the Turks, in their relation to Europe*.

In short, his life as a Catholic, though in the main he gave himself to the manifold activities concerning the Birmingham Oratory and the cause of Catholic education, continued with the same devotion, pace and persistency. Some of his major works were produced during his Catholic years, such as: *Parochial and Plain Sermons* (1868), *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent* (1870), a treatise on the philosophy of religion and *Apologia Pro Vita Sua* (1864), his classic work of spiritual

---

[73] *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain, vol. xv, (London, 1961-72), p. 28

autobiography.

Thus, so far for the purpose of our study, we have shown the life, mind and thought of one of the most unique and mature intellectual personalities of nineteenth-century England, up to the point when Newman was set to deliver those lectures on the History of the Ottoman Turks, which will be our concern in the next chapter. It was the year 1853, and Newman felt the need of the hour to express his views, as an English Christian citizen, as a religious personality and as the voice of the intellectual British reaction to that very critical question of the day known in history as the Crimean War, or the Eastern Question.

But, before turning to it, let us once more observe that John Henry Newman, as a man of his age and a severe critic of his own society, looked for theological truth and found it in that Church which, for him, represented the doctrine and ethos of the first Christian centuries. It was the Catholic Church which later so strongly influenced the way he viewed different issues, as his writings on the Turks and their empire, showed. He left the Church of England because it has been unfaithful to the Catholic tradition. He left the Anglicans because they were Protestants. He resisted with the best of his powers the spirit of liberalism in religion because it was driving the world to unbelief. For all these, he was rightly appraised as "the voice of the intellectual reaction of Europe which was alarmed by an era of revolutions and is looking for safety in the forsaken beliefs of ages which it had been tempted to despise."[74]

---

[74] William Barry, *The Oxford Movement (1833-1845)*, web page http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11370a.htm, p. 14

C H A P T E R II

THE BACKGROUND OF THE CRIMEAN WAR

Before turning to the examination of Newman's study of the Turks, it is necessary to give an introduction to the background of the Crimean War. We may note the traditional hostility between Russia and Turkey which led England to wage a war in support of the Ottoman Empire (for the protection of her own interests in the Near East); British developments in politics and political thought; and British public opinion and the British press. These constitute the fundamental circumstances of that European conflict. In so doing, we shall give a useful background to Newman's lectures on the Ottoman Turks.

Early nineteenth-century European diplomacy, which aimed at the preservation of general international peace and stability, did not succeed in preventing all revolutions and wars. Shortly after the midpoint of the nineteenth century, a major international conflict took place as a result of unsuccessful negotiations to settle the long-running Eastern Question crisis. The Crimean War concerned the fate of Turkey and arose from the western powers' fear of Russia, the recently extended influence of which over Europe and the Middle East endangered the great European powers' interests, especially those of

England. England feared the Russian threat to the European balance of power; and the possible establishment of Russian control over the Ottoman Empire; and the consequent threat to her routes to India; her trade in the Near East and her sea power in the Mediterranean. Thus, she decided to follow a policy of defending British interests cheaply and effectively by preserving the Ottoman Empire with its axis at Constantinople and the Straits.

Apart from European and British interests and closely linked with them, there was also another aspect of that conflict. "The quarrels of the Greeks and Latins," J. A. R. Marriot showed, "were not the least important among the many contributory causes which issued in the great European conflagration…"[75] Russia's demand for the establishment of a Russian protectorate over the Sultan's twelve million Orthodox Christian subjects alarmed the European powers, as it meant free Russsian interference in Turkish affairs. Thus, it was primarily to halt the process of greater Russian expansion and eliminate the Russian threat to the security and interests of the European powers and the Ottoman Empire that the Crimean War was fought.

Retrospective criticism of the Crimean war has tended to the view that the war was at least a blunder and that it might have been avoided. Sir Robert Morier, writing in 1870, perhaps expressed the current opinion when he described it as "the only perfectly useless modern war that has been waged."[76] Useless or not, the war was the result of the

---

[75] J. A. R. Marriot, *The Eastern Question: A Historical Study in European Diplomacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 251

[76] Ibid., p. 249. See also, Norman Rich, *Why the Crimean War?: A Cautionary Tale* (Mc. Grow-Hill Inc., 1991), p. 4

decisions taken by the governments of the countries involved and as such, the British government must take its share of the blame for not taking a tougher line against the Russians much earlier.[77] It was the weakness of the Coalition Cabinet, whose members were divided, which prevented it from resisting public opinion (a very important element in bringing about the war) and, more importantly, checking the Russian Tsar's pretensions.

In the confusing political situation that existed in Britain after the Tory Party split in 1846, the Aberdeen coalition between the Peelite party and the Whig party was formed in 1852. This looked as if it was the germ of a stable governing arrangement. The government was made up of six Peelites, six Whigs and one radical. Lord John Russell was Foreign Secretary and Henry John Temple, Viscount Palmerston, Home Secretary. Though a successful government in domestic affairs, as events showed, it had very divided views on foreign affairs, especially as regards Russian policy towards the Ottoman Empire. The Crimean War brought a clash in the Aberdeen coalition between the two traditions, now represented by Aberdeen and Palmerston. It was this clash between them and the consequent uncertainty of the government about what line to take that gave birth to the Crimean War.

Aberdeen followed by Clarendon had more faith in the tsar's good intentions and hated "the detestable character of Turkish tyranny" over the Balkan Christians, while Palmerston and Russell suspected Russia of having its own designs on European Turkey.

---

[77] Norman Lowe, *Mastering Modern British History* (Macmillan, 1989), p. 166

Therefore, Palmerston supported by Russell and Stratford Canning, the powerful British ambassador in Constantinople, wanted to stand up to the Russians, while Aberdeen believed the problems could be solved by negotations.

Aberdeen regarded the Turks, rather than the Russians, as 'barbarians' and in the present crisis he believed that the Turks' aim was to embroil Britain in their quarrels with Russia. He expressed his opinions in a letter sent to Lord John Russell in September 1854:

> The assurances of prompt and effective aid given by us to the Turks, would in all probability produce war. These barbarians hate us all and would be delighted to take their chance of some advantage by getting us mixed up with the other powers of Christendom. It may be necessary to give them moral support and to try to prolong their existence, but we ought to regard as the greatest mischief any engagement, which compelled us to take up arms for the Turks. [78]

His pacific and conciliatory policy towards the crisis, at the time when Russia's operations in the Balkans aroused great indignation both among British statesmen and in public opinion, had already proved unpopular in 1854 and he was forced to resign. He was replaced by Palmerston in Junuary 1855.

Throughout the tortuous events of 1853-1854, Palmerston, Home Secretary at the time, did not share Aberdeen's convictions. Palmerston, called affectionately "the most English minister," because of his aggressive stance towards foreign powers was always determined to defend British interests wherever they seemed threatened and to uphold Britain's prestige abroad. To accomplish that, Palmerston wanted to prevent the break-up

---

[78] Quoted in Norman Lowe, *Mastering Modern British History* (Macmillan, 1989), p. 171

of the existing international order, which Russia was trying to accomplish. Hence he aimed to preserve Turkey as a reasonably strong state, capable of standing up to Russian ambitions. Furthermore, he suspected Russia's call for the protection of twelve million Orthodox Christian subjects in Turkey, as greatly increasing her political influence in the Ottoman Empire.

Among those British statesmen who distrusted Russia's intentions and believed in the preservation of the Ottoman Empire by applying intensive reforms and giving administrative and institutional assistance to her, the Turcophile attitude and policy prevailed. This policy, Ann Pottinger Saab argued "rested on a series of fundamental misconceptions about the nature of the Ottoman Empire: the character of its leaders' feelings for foreigners, particularly Englishmen; and the desirability, let alone the feasibility, of rapid Westernisation under foreign sponsorship."[79] Furthermore, it was this Turcophile policy, she noted, which for years had nourished among the ordinary English the view "that Russia was evil and Turkey was good, and that Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox were superstitious, while Moslems and Protestants were progressive."[80] This section of British political opinion, primarily influenced by British economic interests in the Near East and by a general distrust of Russia, was more anti-Russian than it was pro-Turkish, in the sense that to resist Russia the only possible way for the British policy was to ensure the survival of Turkey.[81] It represented the tradition that the actions

---

[79] Ann Pottinger Saab, *The Origins of Crimean Alliance* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977), p. 157

[80] Ibid.

[81] Frank Edgar Bailey, *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826- 1853* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942), p. 226

of Russia in the Near East should be always watched with ceaseless vigilance.

But, in England, there existed also another school of thought opposed to the chorus of hate towards Russia, which was not so popular among the British public. Though represented by a small number of supporters, its existence demonstrated the chaotic state of British political thought as to the resolution of the issues. It was the tradition that distrusted the Ottoman Empire and the Turks and disliked the idea of assisting them. They deprecated the prevailing hostility towards Russia and endeavored to mitigate this enmity. On the other hand, contempt was the foundation of their radical judgement. Some of these critics came from the cabinet's supporters, such as Cobden and Bright. They openly opposed the war and blamed the government for drifting into it. With their spirit of pacific conduct of international relationships, they perceived the war as offending their vision of a peaceful world. Apart from that, they, and especially Cobden, viewed the Turks in Europe as intruders, because Europe "is not their domicile or their permanent home…, their home is in Asia,"[82] and there it is that they should be forced to live.

Because the Turks were Mohammedans and "Mohammedanism cannot exist in Europe alongside of civilised states," Cobden thought, Britain should not work to preserve their independence. For he conceived the British attempts to prevent the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire as attempts to maintain and preserve Mohammedanism in Europe. Considering Mohammedanism as the rule of uncivilized

---

[82] Kenneth Bourne, *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p. 323

people who "keep the plague, keep slavery, have a bazaar for the sale of black and white slaves," Cobden asserted that:

> I should be sorry to see this country fighting for the maintenance of Mohammedanism. You may keep Turkey on the map of Europe; you may call the country by the name of Turkey, if you like, but do not think you can keep up the Mohammedan rule in that country.

He disdained the Turks as being Mohammedans therefore he disliked the idea of assisting them, especially when the Turks treated Christians harshly. This must be kept in mind when treating the issue of the independence of the Ottoman Empire, Cobden seemed to suggest.

> The fact is prominently before us, that the Christian element in Turkey in Europe is now the prominent one, and we cannot ignore it…, but if you go into the interior of Turkey all evidence goes to confirm… that the Christian population… have a very hard lot indeed, and they are as much now under the rule and violent domination of an insolent caste and a barbarous people as ever they were.[83]

This would be perpetually so and would continue to be so, if Britain was going to assist them, Cobden pointed out. For, there was no change in their behavior towards the Christians, who continue to be oppressed almost as badly as they were oppressed two or three hundred years before. "Our love for civilization when we subject the Greeks and Christians to the Turks," John Bright asserted in the House of Commons in November 1854, "is a sham."[84] The same opinions seemed also to be held by the great nineteenth-

---

[83] Kenneth Bourne, *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), pp. 323-324

[84] Norman Lowe, *Mastering Modern British History* (Macmillan, 1989), p. 172

century British thinker, John Henry Newman, whose views on this issue we are going to treat of in the following pages. Apart from this point of view, Cobden even opposed the war as a means of securing British commerce in the Near East, and as a free trader, he disliked the idea of fighting for low tariffs and for opening markets for the British economy. "I must once for all enter my protest against fighting for a market at all." [85]

Though declaring that he was not sorry to see the great representative of the despotic principle humiliated and dishonored, it seems that Cobden, induced more by his personal feelings of contempt toward the Turks than by the liberal feeling of dislike of the tyrannies, insisted that of the two, Turkey's tyranny was the worse. Therefore, he addressed the British government: "do not deceive yourselves and pretend that we are the natural allies of such a country for the purposes of trade."[86] Thus, seeing Turkey in this light, it is natural that Cobden took this position of opposing British support for her.

There were also other opinions, which considered Russia praiseworthy, like Lord Londonderry, who was not nominated to the embassy in St. Petersburg because of the general disapproval of his views by public opinion. Being few in number, these voices did not find much support and did not generally reach the public.

Thus, divided and uncertain as the Cabinet was in reference to what line of action to follow, it found it increasingly difficult to resist British public opinion, whose development and influence on the government deserves our attention.

---

[85] Kenneth Bourne, *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), p.325
[86] Ibid., p. 326

British public opinion towards both Russia and Turkey and its interaction with British policy during the period under consideration, will partly make us understand another aspect of the background and of the extra-European roots of the Crimean War.

Anglo-Russian relations in the mid-nineteenth century were a matter of policy and opinion, at least on the British part. After nearly three centuries of consistently friendly political relations, in the early nineteenth century there developed in England an antipathy toward Russia, which, in general, continued for years until it found expression in the Crimean war of 1853. It came to be known in those years and in modern historiography as well, as Russophobia.

The American historian, John Howes Gleason[87] has shown that British popular hostility to Russia re-emerged at a moment when colonial competition between Russia and Great Britain in the Near East was very intense. It was a phenomenon fostered under the influence of many forces, such as economic interests and active competition between the two nations; the permanent inconsistency of Russian foreign policy which brought about a British distrust and suspicion of Russia; British domestic politics which utilized the accidents of foreign affairs to denounce their opponents, thus resulting in the magnifying of a less than serious threat; the character of the increasing knowledge about Russia which tended to make her threat seem more concrete; propaganda delivered by different political authorities and the important role of the press.[88] Each in their way influenced British policy toward Russia and contributed to the popular detestation of her.

---

[87] John Howes Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain: A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950).
[88] Ibid., pp. 284-289.

In fact, British public opinion in general was in a quite feverish state at that time because of recent domestic and foreign political events. As Muriel E. Chamberlain pointed out, "public excitement had mounted in Britain in 1848-1849, as it had on the Continent, but because there had been no blood-letting as there had been on the continent, it was still dangerously pent-up in Britain."[89]

In addition to that, much of the popular hostility toward Russia was stirred up by British journalists in the Near East and the press brought home the horrors and images of the war. William Howard Russell of *The Times* for the first time brought home to the British public the real images of the war. Indeed the impact press propaganda had upon the contemporary public mind and statesmen was great. Available evidence indicates that in general there was an essential agreement among all journals on the anti-Russian position. In short, the press was influential on the British public and statesmen as well and played a major part in fostering British public opinion and even in determining British policy.

Another important point deserves attention. During the years in which this anti-Russian sentiment evolved, there was a prevailing notion in Britain working against a peaceful resolution of the Crimean crisis. This was the notion of "an inescapable *guerre des idees* between the liberal west and the autocratic east of Europe."[90] There was a

---

[89] Muriel E. Chamberlain, *'Pax Britannica'?: British Foreign Policy, 1789-1914* (London and New York: Longmans, 1993), p. 106

[90] John Howes Gleason, *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain: A Study of the Interaction of Policy and Opinion* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950).

popular conception of tsarist Russia as a land of tyranny and oppression, a conception powerfully reinforced by reports of Russia's brutal suppression of the popular insurrections in Poland and Hungary. England itself disliked Russia as an autocratic and authoritarian empire, while the general public opinion conceived the war as a constitutional system of government fighting against the despotic principle. It was seen as a war of principles. This may be also a partial explanation of the suspicion with which Russia's policy was regarded both by British statesmen and the British public.

Thus, in mid nineteenth-century England there was sound ground on which anti-Russian sentiment grew and established itself firmly, though not only that. The intervention of public opinion in foreign affairs was by no means necessarily a benevolent force. Whether public opinion had a good or bad influence on British foreign policy, the Crimean War showed that a time had come when Britain, as a country moving towards democracy and liberalism, could not ignore a public enthusiasm, which later was blamed for driving the country to war.

Now we have examined the international background of the Crimean War; British political developments and debates related to the Crimean crisis; and the influence British public opinion and press had on the conduct of British foreign policy, we focus now on one of the most prominent voices of the nineteenth-century British intelligentsia, who pronounced himself on the position and attitude that his country should take in the Crimean crisis. It is Newman's thought and views in reference to the Turks and their empire that the next chapter will explore.

C H A P T E R III

NEWMAN AND HIS HISTORY OF THE TURKS IN THEIR RELATION TO EUROPE

Newman's sketch of Turkish history, which we are going to examine here, is a collection of lectures Newman delivered at the Catholic Institute of Liverpool during October 1853. As Newman himself explained, this survey of the history of the Turks came about as a result of the temporary circumstances of those years when England was preparing to undertake "a great war on behalf of the Turks."[91] The historical sketch was written just before Britain and France declared war on Russia in support of Turkey. Thus, writing at a very critical moment and aiming to "conduct the reader to some definite conclusions, as to what is to be wished, what to be done, in the present state of the East,"[92] the background of these lectures was the hostility between Russia and Turkey. This conflict, Newman pointed out, "is only one scene in that persevering conflict, which is carried on, from age to age, between the North and the South, - the North aggressive, the South on the defensive."[93] It was a war behind which stood both political and religious confrontations and rivalries and, above all, as Newman perceived it, a war between two Christian powers. But what was inconceivable for Newman was that his country was fighting against another Christian

---

[91] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. xi
[92] Ibid., p. xii
[93] Ibid., p. 1

power, which aimed, as Newman believed, at delivering Eastern Europe from that "infamous power, the enemy of god and man."[94] This is how Newman referred to the Ottoman Empire, and in all his work, there are few cases where he did not use harsh words towards the Turks and their Empire. This fact, and his attitude towards the Turks in general, has led modern historians to define his *History of the Turks* as "a work of racial hatred," and come to the conclusion that, the work really represented "Newman`s contempt for the East."[95] In fact, at first sight it may leave such an impression because its language is indeed harsh. But, in reality it was not so much 'a work of racial hatred' and 'contempt for the East,' as a work intended to direct British public attention to an important issue, that is, the issue of 'civilisation' among the Turks, which was generally neglected when considering the Eastern Question. His work, more than 'hatred' and 'contempt' towards the Turks, should be understood as expressing his great distrust of the Turks, a declining non-European nation, of their state, culture and society. Newman himself, conscious of any misunderstanding and misinterpretation of his work, stated that, in reality, he did not have "any special interest in them for their own sake."[96] He just wanted to give his own view and opinion on a matter so fundamental to the solution of that long Eastern Question, as he considered the issue of 'civilisation.' And in fact, his work, not only showed that distrust was the only sentiment one might feel when considering the

---

[94] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. xii
[95] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 155
[96] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 159

whole history of the Ottoman Empire, but also that it was hypocritical both to condemn the Russians and to pretend that Turkish power could be permanently established. Instead a constructive, positive policy was needed in the face of growing Russian strength and the Turkish decline.

It should also be noted that Newman is generally considered and thought very hostile to progress and indifferent to civilisation by modern historians, though the present historiography still continues to debate this. It will be treated here.

As a religious figure of considerable authority, Newman was uneasy about taking on the role of a politician. Nevertheless, believing that Russia, as a Christian Power, was attempting to deliver Eastern Europe from the domination of Muslim Turkey, which, "since the year 1048," has been "the great Antichrist among the races of men,"[97] Newman was firmly opposed to his country`s pro-Ottoman policy. Furthermore, he speaks harshly for those powers of Europe, England included, which for centuries had neglected the voice of the papacy on Eastern matters; for "had the advice of the Holy See been followed, there would have been no Turks in Europe for the Russian to turn out of it." After all, Newman stated, "as they have sown, so must they reap."[98] As a popular lecturer addressing a Catholic audience, Newman undertook the duty of showing and advising his countrymen that it was not only unwise, but also pernicious, in the long run, to take the side of a declining non-European nation, which had been "in all cases, to the Christian, the

---

[97] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 105
[98] Ibid., p. xii

inveterate and hateful enemy of the Cross,"[99] against a growing European Christian power, just because of fear of the latter. It was more than unwise, Newman appealed to the public, to tolerate Turkey`s existence, just because the mutual jealousies of Christian powers demanded it. It seemed foolish to him that, merely for the sake of some ambitious interests, England was going to war to prevent a Christian power from destroying a declining non-Christian empire.

He even came to warn his audience that, in judging the events in history, one should be led not "by their outward appearance, but by their inward significance."[100] Therefore, in judging the present state of the Eastern crisis, the British should not forget, Newman seems to suggest, who those people, on behalf of whom they were fighting, really were. It should not be forgotten that, despite the powerful empire they had been able to build, they, "at the end of many centuries are just what they were at the beginning" and were still "far from making progress."[101] However, his fundamental call to his audience was that the British should not forget that "from the first moment they appear in the history of Christendom, they are its unmitigated, its obstinate, its consistent foes."[102] As Newman saw them, they had been assailing Christianity for centuries. Thus, to show who the Turks were "in their inward significance," since their first appearance in history up to the moment Newman was writing, and to show, based on their history, who perhaps they will be in the

---

[99] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908),, p. 106
[100] Ibid., p. 104
[101] Ibid., p. 206
[102] Ibid., p. 105

future, Newman produced that concise history of the Turks, to which he later referred disparagingly as 'trash.'[103] We may perhaps from this statement conclude that we have here Newman being far less careful than usual, because of the necessary urgency of writing this political propaganda. Things not usually revealed by the studied, cautious Newman may be revealed here.

Regarding the Turks, as their history introduced them to Europe and Christendom, Newman tried to address and answer some precise questions, worthy of discussion. He offered some definite conclusions as to what was to be done in order to prevent Europe from being endangered by this Muslim people. His historical sketch of the Turks presents an explanation full of arguments, which serve completely to prove his main argument that the whole of Europe, including Constantinople, should be in the hands of Christians. To accomplish that, England should avoid war with Russia, which, as a Christian power, wished to deliver Eastern Europe from the Turks.

Newman divided his history of the Turks into four chapters, each one with a precise aim. The first, *The Mother Country of the Turks* dealt with their first appearance in history. In it, Newman gave a simple explanation of that "persevering" and continuous historical conflict between the North and the South, where "the South ever has gifts of nature to tempt the invader, and the North ever has multitudes to be tempted by them."[104] He described the original homeland of the Turks, named Tartary, whose geographical features carried its habitants from age to age towards

---

[103] Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 402
[104] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 105

"the civilisation and the luxury of the West and of the South."[105] He spoke of the wild life of its inhabitants, whose habits were created by their environment, thus, emphasizing the role of the nature in the formation of character. Then, Newman went on to narrate the ancient history of conflict between the inhabitants of Tartary and other ancient monarchies and empires, until they came to develop into three barbarian tribes: the Huns, the Moguls and the Mahometan. As their ancient history and ancient records suggested to him, Newman called these terrible tribes "the ever enemies of God and persecutors of His Church."[106] "The only missionaries," Newman intentionally remarked, "who have had any influence upon them, have been those of the Nestorian heresy."[107] Here, as in many other cases, Newman draws a provocative analogy, emphasising that, since, in the first stages of their development, the Tartar tribes were inclined towards heresy, unlike the Celts, Goths, Lombards and Franks, who had embraced orthodox Christianity. Having shown that when they first appeared in history, the Turks were just Huns or Tartars, and nothing else, Newman closed his first chapter.

The second chapter, *The Descent of the Turks* is divided in two parts: *The Tartar and the Turk* and *The Turk and the Saracen.* It begins by suggesting to the reader that unfortunately the Turks did not remain merely Tartars: they developed, as Newman insisted, "in spite of their essential barbarism..., to a consolidate imperial

---

[105] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 8-9
[106] Ibid., p. 35
[107] Ibid.

power."[108] Newman accepted the fact that they developed into some kind of social and political union; but this was very different in mode and circumstances from the path Christian nations followed. For instance, "other nations have been civilised in their own homes and by their social progress," while the Turks "have been educated by their conquests, or by subjugation, or by the intercourse with foreigners...; but, in every case they have been true to their father-land, and are children of the soil."[109]

Newman, we see, accepted geographical determinism, as the philosophers of the Enlightenment did. Like Montesquieu, whom he used to argue his point, Newman emphasized the influence of nature and climate in the modification of the Turk`s character and nature. The peculiarities of the soils and climate of the countries which they invaded, Newman held, were "far from being unimportant," when one speaks for the peoples of Asia.[110] Because the regions of Asia are either very hot or very cold, one will find there people who are either strong or weak, and because "mental cultivation is best carried on in temperate regions..., science, literature and art refuse to germinate in the frost, and are burnt up by the sun."[111] With this explanation, Newman noted that it was the Turks' establishment in such temperate, fruitful, rich and fair regions like Sogdiana or Bukharia in central Asia, which gave them possibilities to move in the direction of civilisation.[112] But, for Newman, though

---

[108] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 48-49
[109] Ibid., pp. 58-59
[110] Ibid., p. 60
[111] Ibid., p.61
[112] Ibid., pp. 60-69

geography was an element, which, especially in Asia, modified and shaped their history, it was not enough for social change and civilization. Temperate climate and fertile country, though this, in the course of generations, may have sensibly softened the fierce Tartar characteristics of the Turks, were important. Yet other influences were needed to move them in the direction of civilisation.[113] Apart from geography, Newman maintained later in his work, knowledge and progress were other elements which the Turks needed in order to reach civilisation. But, these we will treat gradually.

Though the Turks were favoured by the geographical conditions of parts of central Asia, their way towards civilisation was interrupted. As Newman showed, it was the triumph of Mohammedanism in Arabia, which extended up to Sogdiana that interrupted or, better say, modified their Tartar character in another way or direction. "They succumbed to the creed of Mahomet," Newman stated, by drawing another analogy, "and they embraced it with the ardour and enthusiasm which Franks and Saxons so gloriously and meritoriously manifested in their conversion to Christianity."[114] On the other hand, it was their religion, Newman remarked, recognizing the strict monotheism of Mohammedanism, that modified and gave their national character some elements of gravity and apathy of demeanour, an innate self-respect, which one may observe even in the lower ranks of society and strangely among the children.[115] "Its sternness, its coldness, its doctrine of fatalism…, its severe

---

[113] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 60, 67-68
[114] Ibid., p. 71
[115] Ibid., p. 72

view of the divine attributes, of the law, wrought both a gloom and also an improvement in the barbarian, not very unlike the effect which some forms of Protestantism produce among ourselves."[116] But Newman's criticism of that "depraved religion, which has had something to do with the civilisation of the Turks," went even further when he criticised its "consecration of the principle of nationalism," which makes it a religion "as congenial to the barbarian as Christianity is congenial to man civilized."[117]

Though, Newman acknowledged what was salutary and true in Mohammedanism: "it embodies in it some ancient and momentous truth, and is undeniably beneficial so far as their proper influence extends," when looked at as a religion, he remarked "it is as debasing to the populations which receive it as it is false."[118] It was true, Newman believed, insofar as those truths that it held, such as "the being of one Good, the fact of His revelation, His faithfulness to His promises, the eternity of the moral law, the certainty of future retribution were just borrowed by Mahomet from the Church, and are steadfastly held by his followers." It was debasing to its populations because "it subserves the reign of barbarism…, it fosters those very faults in the barbarian which keep him from ameliorating his condition…, it encourages a barbarian recklessness of mind."[119] And it does these in three departments of intellectual activity: legislation, money transaction and finance, and

---

[116] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 72
[117] Ibid., pp. 59, 203
[118] Ibid., pp. 198-199
[119] Ibid., pp. 87, 199

the fine arts. The first, that is the civil code, was already fixed in the Koran, which also forbade them taking interest for money and representing the human form or any natural substance in sculpture, painting and architecture.[120]

Here Newman drew a great contrast between Mohammedanism and Christianity. For, while the first has extended its revelations in secular matters and restrained its disciples from developing and progressing in those areas, the latter

> has carefully guarded against extending its revelations to any point which would blunt the keenness of human research or the activity of human toil…, it has confined its revelations to the province of theology, only indirectly touching on other departments of knowledge…, in which the human mind, left to itself, could not profitably exercise itself, or progress.[121]

This was one of the reasons, Newman noted, that Christian nations made "progress in secular matters."[122] This point obviously corrects the view of Newman as hostile to progress. By embracing that "religious imposture," Newman explained, they stood between "the religion of God and the religion of devils, between Christianity and idolatry…, between Christ in the West and Satan in the East" and, as they had to make their choice "they were led by the circumstances of the time to oppose themselves, not to Paganism, but to Christianity."[123]

Because "they forced westward against the truth and fought it zealously," Newman remarked, they were "of all races the veriest brood of the serpent which the Church has encountered since she was set up."[124] Here, the hatred of Newman

---

[120] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 199
[121] Ibid., p. 200
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid., p. 87
[124] Ibid., p. 88

towards the Muslim Turks culminated, in giving to his audience sufficient reasons for abandoning that traditional ungrounded anti-Russian sentiment, as Newman perceived it, which was so popular among the British public. Instead he suggested to them an anti-Turkish sentiment, whose religious grounds seemed more meaningful. In fact, this is what Newman was calling for. The present conflict in the east, Newman insisted, should be seen from a religious point of view and not from that of the political or economical interests of the states involved.

Newman's third chapter was completely dedicated to the historical contacts of the Turks with the papacy and Christendom in general, from the first crusade until the famous battle of Lepanto. "War with the Turks," Newman narrated, "was his [the pope's] uninterrupted cry for seven or eight centuries, from the eleventh to the eighteenth; it is a solitary and singular event in the history of the Church, the object of alarm for all Christendom."[125] He was resolved to show the perseverance of the Popes in protecting Christendom from the Muslim Turks. This was an essential history lesson for his countrymen. Looking back to the history of the Church, as was usual with Newman, for there the Christians find their tradition, inherited from the centuries. As they fought for centuries, under the leadership of the papacy, with the greatest zeal and hostility against the Turkish threat to Christendom, so nineteenth-century Christians were to go on, until they destroyed the enemy once and for all. Newman's call for a regeneration of religious feeling among the British public, especially when such decisive matters for the whole Christendom were at issue, is

[125] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 108

self-evident and clear. Furthermore, because "the Holy See has the reputation… of seeing instinctively what is favourable, what is unfavourable, to the interests of religion and of the Catholic faith," the faithful were to listen to its advice and follow it. Because the Holy See has denounced them once for all as "the more efficient foes of faith and civilisation…, the faithful never could have sympathy, never alliance"[126] with the Turks. Christian should never fight against Christian; Christians united should fight against the "infidel" Turks, who, for him, were the greatest of Christendom's enemies. This was, in terms of history, the reason Newman opposed the war Britain was preparing for.

After making this important point, Newman dealt with the present and the future of the Turks. His aim was to offer an introduction to the condition of the Ottoman Empire, the character of its state and society. In the previous chapters, Newman showed that the early history of the Turks was the history of those Tartar tribes, who, though in the course of time they came to develop a kind of social and political organisation, still maintained the barbarous and ferocious characteristics of the Tartar or Scythian tribes. These characteristics Newman found not only in their past, but also in their present state. To develop his main argument that "the Turkish power certainly is not a civilised, and is a barbarous power,"[127] Newman analysed the nature of the Ottoman state and its system of administration and the leading features of Turkish life, simply on the basis of the two abstractions of 'barbarism' and

---

[126] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 110-111

[127] Ibid., p. 183

'civilisation.' He constructed his theory of 'civilisation' and 'barbarism' based on the notions of progress and knowledge.

In fact, as we mentioned above, Newman is generally thought indifferent to civilisation and hostile to progress by some modern historians. This view was represented by Robert Pattison in his work, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy*, in which he called Newman as "the uncontaminated antagonist of everything modern."[128] In his comments on Newman, the great dissenter, from what has been held characteristic of the nineteenth century, he pointed out that as a dogmatic and conservative Catholic, fighting against the liberalism of the modern age, Newman did not allow a love for civilisation to "subvert his duty to religion," and, therefore, he "rejected civilisation and looked for truth in eternity."[129] Pattison's conviction was based on Newman's concern with the principle of dogma. The modern world was the world in which liberalism prevailed. In the modern world Church authority and the truths it served were assailed by the forces of liberalism. Modern culture was deeply infected by a "spirit, which tends to overthrow doctrine."[130] What Newman despised in modern culture was the anti-dogmatic principle of its liberalism. Therefore, Newman dedicated all his strength to the fight against liberalism. Because liberalism "had rejected the dogmatic principle, and with that rejection it had denied

---

[128] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. vi
[129] Ibid., pp. 205-207
[130] *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1978-84), p. 130

the truth,"[131] for Newman, liberalism was an obviously fundamental heresy.

The origins of liberalism, Newman revealed, were to be sought in the Arian revolt against belief.[132] Because Arius held false beliefs, he had defined dogma as valueless. For Newman, the story of Arianism, Pattison pointed out, "would prove that belief determines the fate of individuals, that belief dominates all action, that belief shapes history."[133] Thus, for Newman, his Arian researches had revealed a great truth about belief: belief is the base of human life, therefore belief shapes history. Belief constituted by ideas and views, Newman maintained, "has an object and when that object is real and divine, belief merges into dogma."[134] "The combination of correct belief and right action," Newman maintains, constitutes truth. Because "the mind is made for truth," he explains, "human action can only be understood in light of the belief, or the lack of belief." Action separated from belief is error. The world is only as good as its belief, Newman held, and the beliefs of the modern world are heretical.[135] The modern world was dammed by Newman because it did not believe and therefore could not act the truth. "Armed with these insights," Pattison pointed out, "Newman produced the most uncompromising condemnation of modern civilisation yet attempted."[136]

Based on this theory of dogma and belief Newman distinguished three

---

[131] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 145
[132] Ibid., p. 100
[133] Ibid., p. 102
[134] Ibid., p. 153
[135] Ibid., pp. 145-176
[136] Ibid., p. vii

types of cultures. For him, there were cultures which, built on right and true belief, were destined to prosper. These cultures, for Newman, were inevitably civilised.[137] As the only true system of belief was Christianity, therefore Christianity is "the religion of civilisation."[138] There were other cultures, which were built on wrong belief and as such destined to ruin from within by the error and heresy. Cultures which held to wrong beliefs were always subject to decay, though they might be civilised.[139] However, there are also cultures, which exist on the basis of a belief in the despotism of their rulers, which Newman called 'barbarous.' An example was Ottoman Turkey, which Newman classed in the same group with the Huns of Attila and the Incas of Peru. "Religion, superstition, belief in persons and families, objects, not provable, but vivid and imposing," were the bonds which kept barbarians together, while in the civilised cultures "the divine virtue has been considered to rest, not on the monarch, but on the code of laws, which accordingly is the social principle of the nation."[140] Newman also asserted that belief was constructed from ideas and views[141] and the barbarians had the ideas from which belief might be constructed, but they did not use them because "they have not the ratiocinative habit to scrutinize

---

[137] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), p. 180

[138] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 202

[139] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 183-184

[140] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 171

[141] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 145

and invalidate them."[142] Thus their power was founded on no ideas at all, but on mere customs. This was Newman's theory of civilization, based on the dogmatic principle.

But Newman's interest in the enforcement of dogma and his theory of belief did not prevent him from seeing the reality of the world around him. They did not "isolate him from all things modern,"[143] as Pattison showed. On the contrary, when he considered the history of the Turks, he showed that there was space for some alteration in his theory and thought, at least when he was confronted with Turkish reality. In this context, I think, should be understood Newman's theory of civilisation based now, not on dogma and belief, but on progress, though, as we shall see, the notion of progress was contained within his dominant view. The difference is one of emphasis. For Newman *barbarism* meant "a state of nature," in which "man has reason, conscience, affections and passions" and he permits them to influence him according to the circumstances, without putting them "under the control of principle" and "without regard to consequences." "He does not improve his talents and fix his motives. He lives with what means nature gives him to live and defend himself and he does not improve them. He grows up pretty much what he was when a child."[144] C*ivilisation* is "a state of mental cultivation and discipline… to which man's nature points and tends." In contrast to barbarism, *civilisation* is

---

[142] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 171-172

[143] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 186

[144] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 162-164

> the systematic use, improvement, and combination of those faculties which are his characteristic… It is the development of art out of nature, and of self-government out of passion, and of certainty out of opinion, and of faith out of reason.[145]

Based on his own understanding of these notions, Newman came to distinguish the differences between barbarous states, which "live in a common *imagination,* and are destroyed from *without*," and civilised states, which "live in some common object of *sense*, and are destroyed from *within*."[146] He explained that by *imagination,* which was the bond of barbarian societies, he meant "religion, true or false, a divine mission of a sovereign or of a dynasty, and historical fame," whereas by *objects of sense,* under which the civilised states live, he meant "secular interests, country, home, protection of person and property."[147]

Civilised states, Newman noted, have their motive principles, such as "justice, benevolence, expedience, propriety and religion," and they "acknowledge supernatural truth as their sovereign law." Such societies are "synonymous with Christianity." Therefore, "not only in idea, but in matter of fact also, is Christianity ever civilisation."[148] The barbarian "lives without principle and aim." He has "no individuality" and "no history." "Quarrels between neighbouring tribes, grudges, blood-shedding, exhaustion, raids, success, defeat, the same thing over and over again."[149] This is the character of their society.

Newman introduced three points, from which, as animals differ from humans,

---

[145] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp.163-165
[146] Ibid., p. 162
[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid., p. 165
[149] Ibid., pp. 183, 167

so barbarian states differ from civilized ones. These are progress, invention and improvement. According to him, the barbarian, though he has reason, does not act upon it, but "upon instinct." Therefore, unlike the civilized states, the barbarian ones "cannot invent and cannot progress." "They are endowed by the law of their being…, and they do not improve on them."[150] The civilized states are governed by intellect, therefore they always advance further and further. So that "their distinguishing badge is progress." Because "mental ability is the honor badge of civilized states," Newman continued, "civilised states are ever developing into a more perfect organization…, they are ever increasing their stock of thoughts and of knowledge: ever creating, comparing, disposing and improving."[151] Therefore "ratiocination and its kindred processes … are the necessary instruments of … progress, which are "hostile to *imagination* and auxiliary to *sense.*"[152]

Thus, the objects that constitute the life of a barbarian community, as Newman noted, are very different from those of a civilised society. Led by instinct, and not reason, the barbarian state makes no mental progress. "It has no talent for analysis; it can not understand expediency; it is impressed and affected by what is direct and absolute,"[153] that is, religion and belief in the divinity of the ruler or dynasty. Furthermore, the barbarian satisfies himself in the circumstances which surround him.

---

[150] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 163-164
[151] Ibid., pp. 167-168
[152] Ibid., p. 170
[153] Ibid.

He does nothing to develop them. He even "does but reflect the successive outward circumstances in which he finds himself, and he varies with them."[154] This is not only how the individual is, but also the condition of his generation and of previous and future ones. For, while "for retrogression there is hardly room," certainly "for progress" there is "no sort of material."[155] Since barbarian states admit of no mental progress, not only can they not accept civilisation, but "their dissolution can not come from themselves."[156] Such states, Newman remarked, are destined to be "destroyed from *without.*" Sooner or later, they will come to an end, brought about by "foreign wars, foreign influence or accidental enormities of individuals in power." For, they "have the life of a stone, and, unless pounded and pulverized," they are "indestructible." Thus, their destiny, Newman concluded, is "a violent death."[157] This is the destiny of the barbarian states and the destiny of the Turkish power, as Newman foresaw it. For, not only does a natural law determine that as empires rise, so they will fall, as history has shown; but, moreover, the nature and the character of the Turkish state and society showed that it had "nothing inside of it, and to be moved solely or mainly by influences from without."[158] It now seemed inclined towards its fall and dissolution. So a war in support of a barbarous, un-civilised, un-progressive, and, moreover, a declining power was, for Newman, unworthy. With this conviction in mind he opposed his country`s policy.

---

[154] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 183
[155] Ibid.
[156] Ibid., p. 172
[157] Ibid., pp. 220, 162
[158] Ibid., p. 208

Newman also argued in his writings that the history of the Turks completely justified his own theory — not only of the Turks' past, but also their present state. The characteristics of the barbarian states on which he drew, Newman found fundamental to the picture of the Turks. Though, in general, people are attracted to the former greatness of their empire, Newman pointed out, the Turks, have nothing to "show to the human race for their long spell of power."[159] In spite of their "natural excellences" or "their innocent aspect," he found no progress or development in their knowledge, science and culture. The Turks of his day, Newman noted, were

> still in the less than infancy of art, literature, philosophy, and general knowledge; and we may fairly conclude that, if they have not learned the very alphabet of science in eight hundred years, they are not likely to set to work on it in the nine hundredth.[160]

Moreover, Newman found such elements in their political administration and governance, in their national habits and principles, which really disillusioned him, when he thought of the possibility of the growth of civilisation among them. Such were for instance, the prohibition of the change of law and government by the sultans, as under Suleyman the Magnificient, and the failure of the reforms which had been undertaken.[161] For, though they "began with such changes as were easiest," they were hardly received by the population. "Failure in these small matters suggests how little ground there is for hope of success in other advances more important and difficult,"[162]

---

[159] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 189
[160] Ibid., p. 192.
[161] Ibid., pp. 192-193
[162] Ibid., pp. 193-194

Newman noted. The triumph of loyalty to their imperial line, their self-adoration and grave deportment, their general apathy and indolence to active employment, their self-esteem and national pride, and above all their contempt for foreigners, Newman noted, raise the question whether they are "likely to receive civilisation from the nations of the West, whom … they definitively divide into the hog and the dog?"[163]

Not only as a nation, but also as a political body, Newman pointed out, they had no history of their "inward development … since they crossed Mount Olympus and planted themselves in Broussa."[164] There is no change of shape and feature among them, "no representative of Confucius…; no magi…; no Socrates…; no Caesar…; no invasion or adoption of foreign mysteries; nothing really on the type of Catholic religious orders; no Luther, nothing, in short, which, for good or evil, marks the presence of a life internal to the political community itself."[165] Newman found that even the idea of empire they took from the Saracens when they served in their army, while the strange phenomenon of the constitution and the end of the Janisaries was "a singular exemplification of the unproductiveness of the Turkish intellect."[166]

Their internal conditions and peculiarities, Newman showed, made it difficult to contemplate a certain prospect for their empire, though he tried to do it, to some extent, from their past and present history. Thus, Newman was convinced and showed that the Turks would never "as an existing nation, accept of modern civilisation" and

---

[163] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 205
[164] Ibid, p. 213
[165] Ibid., pp. 213-214
[166] Ibid., p. 219

"be able to stand their ground amid the encroachments of Russia."[167] He concluded that the only true resolution of the Eastern Question lay in the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and the return of the "fierce spirits" by "their free will … into the desert," in which they would live "in freedom … in the presence of their brethren."[168]

As shown above, Newman analysed the history of the Turks on the basis of the notions of 'civilisation' and 'barbarism.' He showed in those writings that for him 'civilisation' was the synonym of 'refinement,' 'improvement' and 'progress'. Geographical determinism and progress, as auxiliaries to religion, were, as noted, for Newman the factors which led human beings towards civilisation. This shows that Newman, in his writings on the Ottoman Turks, was, to some considerable extent, influenced by Enlightenment views, and, in particular, the nineteenth-century Orientalist view of the Turks which emerged from them. The claim of the supremacy of the Occident over the Orient was extensively represented in nineteenth-century Western European historiography. It was a position almost universally assumed, by virtue of belief in the superiority of Western Europe's civilization. In this framework, in the eyes of the West, Turkey was regarded not only as "the sick man of Europe," doomed to expire, but also a 'barbarous' culture, uncivilised and incapable of progress. This view was also evident in the sources Newman selected to consult (as we will see later), and in his open attitude towards the nineteenth-century secularist view of the Turks that those sources held.

---

[167] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 229
[168] Ibid., p. 228

In his writings, Newman not only showed that the whole history of the Turks itself was the history of an uncivilised people, but he also wanted to make clear to his countrymen that when the British considered the Turks' future, it should not be judged with reference merely to political or economic interest. Above all, Newman showed, the British should consider the nature of that power, the principle and the character of its life. To come to a correct resolution of the matter, Newman advised, above all "we have to inquire what its life consists in, and what are the dangers to which that life, from the nature of its constitution, is exposed."[169] This statement and Newman's writings on the Turks altogether permit us to think that, for Newman civilisation, and progress which he considered its "main badge," were important elements that should not be neglected when dealing with the Turks and the Ottoman Empire. Thus, Newman did indeed favour civilisation and progress, at least when he dealt with the history of the Turks and their future.

Newman not only showed that the Turks were barbarous and uncivilised, but also that the history of civilised states is quite unlike that of barbarian states. He showed that the civilised states in which "the intellect… is recognised as the ultimate authority" and as their primary strength, this strength constitutes also their weakness. For, while barbarous states have "the strength of conservatism," in civilised states "the cultivation of reason and the spread of knowledge for a time develop and at length dissipate the elements of political greatness," for "where thought is encouraged, too many will think, and will think too much," The result was the fading

[169] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), p. 162

away of "the sentiment of sacredness in institutions," and in the long run "the common bond of unity in the state consists… simply in the unanimous wish of each member of it to secure his own interests."[170] Then, those states die a natural death. And in fact, this is the very situation to which the modern world of Newman's time had come and for which Newman felt regret. This helps to explain why he dedicated his life to the revival and enforcement of the religious feeling and dogma in the English Church and then, perceiving the cause to be lost there, entered the Roman Church.

According to Newman, civilised cultures, in which the increase of knowledge was encouraged and progress prevailed, would inevitably decline. Here, Newman introduced another view of civilisation. Unlike the previous view that "progress is the badge of civilisation," now Newman asserts that progress also endangers dogma and necessitates a decline. Thus, for him, civilisation assailed dogma and that for Newman was heresy. It is here that Newman showed himself less than enthusiastic about civilisation. It is here that Newman sacrifices civilisation for the sake of dogma. Because he could not accept "the worship of civilisation at the expense of faith," which to him was "rank liberalism," Pattison noted, Newman rejected the thought that civilisation, "the progressive amelioration of mankind" was valuable and divine.[171] As a defender of truth and of the primacy of belief and dogma Newman seems to be ready to make that sacrifice. His love for civilisation (for, as we showed above,[172]

---

[170] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 173-174

[171] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 43

[172] See p. 20 of this study.

Newman favoured civilisation when he spoke of the Turks), did not permit him to "subvert his duty to religion."[173] And this duty, as he felt it, was the revival of the dogmatic principle. Considering this second view of Newman on civilisation we can share Pattison's view, if qualified in elaboration.

The problem of the definition of civilisation assumes importance here. In his own philosophy, Newman seems to introduce two different definitions of civilisation: civilisation as 'progress' and civilisation as a product of dogma. We recall that Newman held that "no civilisation could endure which failed to enforce Christian dogma."[174] When he spoke of the barbarous Turks, Newman availed himself of his definition of civilisation based on progress, while when he spoke of the civilised cultures he used that based on dogma. Perhaps Newman thought it more important to raise the problem of civilisation as progress when he spoke of an uncivilised and barbarian culture, the future of which was

> in the way of the progress of the nineteenth century…, in the way of the Russians, who wish to get into the Mediterranean; … in the way of the English, who wish to cross to the East; … in the way of the French, who, from the Crusades to Napoleon, have felt a romantic interest in Syria; … in the way of the Austrians, their hereditary foe.[175]

While, when he dealt with civilized cultures, in which progress exists and prevails, dogma and belief took precedence for him. For while barbarous cultures did not believe and had no dogmas, civilized cultures required to have their adherence to

---

[173] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 207
[174] Ibid., p. 183
[175] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches,* vol. 1, (London: Longmans, Greed & Co., 1908), pp. 222-223

dogma strengthened to prevent their decay. And it is this view, which permits us to think that Newman did not allow his concern for dogma to blind his vision of the modern world and allowed some place in his thought for positive alteration. For, as Newman held, perhaps "in the centuries to come there may be found out some way of uniting what is free in the new structure of society with what is authoritative in the old."[176]

---

[176] Quoted in Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 185

C H A P T E R IV

NEWMAN AND NINETEENTH-CENTURY WRITERS ON THE TURKS AND THEIR EMPIRE

In the previous chapter I dealt with Newman's consideration of the history of the Turks, since their first appearance in history; their mother country in the middle of Asia; their descent from those remote areas of Asia to Europe; their gradual rise and progress by conquests to extensive power under the Ottomans; and their relations to Europe and the whole Christendom. He laid down some peculiarities and characteristics of civilised and barbarous cultures and he showed that these characteristics of the barbarian were fundamental points in a picture of the Turks. With this view in mind, he argued for his conviction that the Ottoman power was of a barbarian character, by analysing their national character and its modification during the centuries, their general manners and peculiar habits, their culture, art and religion, their governance and conduct of the domestic and foreign affairs. He tried to introduce some historical conclusions about the future of the Turks, thus involving himself in answering a major historical question of that time.

In drawing up the picture of the past and present state of the Ottomans, Newman availed himself of the information supplied by different authorities and writers, which he considered as "men of name and ability, and for various reasons

preferable as authorities to writers of the present day."[177] In fact, in his history of the Turks, as he himself asserted, Newman "attempted nothing more than to group old facts" and "materials which are to be found in any ordinarily furnished library" together "in his own way."[178] This assertion allows us to think that it was not only Newman who believed that the Ottoman power and the Turks were 'barbarian', but there were also other men and reliable authorities from whom he borrowed words and phrases, who had the same convictions and opinions in reference to the Turks and their empire. To show that he was not alone in holding those convictions, Newman, as we will show here, in the main, based his study on the accounts, evidence and considerations of those nineteenth century writers and travellers, who shared his views and opinions. To move British public opinion on foreign policy by strongly emphasizing the issue of 'civilisation' among the Turks (the main purpose of these lectures), Newman intentionally made much use of their information. Furthermore, if Newman's statement of "attempting to group old facts in his own way" be accurate, then, it shows that Newman's view of the Turks was not a really mid nineteenth- century view. His statements and the sources he chose to refer to as well, show that Newman's view was a deliberately old-fashioned one.

In fact, it is true that long before the outbreak of the Crimean War, growing numbers of British and other travellers and investigators, privately or under the auspices of others, explored the East, to which the Ottoman Empire was the gate.

---

[177] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 184
[178] Ibid., p. xi

It was also the meeting place and the battleground where the conflicting interests of the Occident clashed. Induced by various motives, travellers and investigators came to explore the vast regions of the Ottoman Empire, not only physically, but also in its government and institutions, the character and nature of its power, its social condition and the peculiarities and the nature of its inhabitants. Therefore, at the time Newman drew up his short history of the Turks, there was a vast literature that supplied him with an abundant corpus of information on the Ottoman Empire and society, especially on its latter-day state. In fact, Newman seems to have made much use of them and especially of some very authoritative writers, such as Edward Gibbon, Hugh Murray, Thomas Thornton, Constantin Francois de Volney, Alexander Dow etc, on whose accounts and historical considerations, the sources of inspiration and information for Newman, this chapter will focus.

At the time of the European researches in the East, the travellers who undertook the exploration of those remote areas were well aware of the interest and excitement that their discoveries would excite among their countrymen. Asia had been the object of a deep and permanent interest not only for the nature and character of its empires and societies, with their striking contrasts, but also for that preserved state of things, which was stamped upon it. Unlike Europe, where all things had changed and only a few remains recorded the ancient world, in Asia, Murray remarked in 1820, “we see empires, whose origin is lost in the unknown beginning of time; a system of laws, institutions, and ideas, which has remained unaltered during thousands of years, a picture of the domestic life of man, as it existed in the earliest middle ages… Asia,

therefore, presents to us, man, not only as he now exists, but as he has been in many former ages."[179]

But, while Murray and many other travellers were attracted by that preserved state of things in the East since the earliest ages, Newman viewed it from a different angle. It was in a state of ignorance, making no progress and remaining at the end of many centuries what it was at the beginning. "The Turkish power," he pointed out, "has now completed its eighth century since Togrul Beg, the first Seljukian Sultan; and what has been the fruit of so long a duration?" Unlike other European nations, in which "there was a continuous progression, and the end was unlike the beginning… the Turks, except that they have gained the faculty of political union, are pretty much what they were when they crossed the Jaxartes and Oxus."[180]

Travellers, in general, had directed their researches to examine the antiquities of the East. A kind of resentment was widely expressed by the European travellers, which Newman also adopted in his work. They noted that a nation, not held to be an heir of Greco-Roman civilization, was in occupation of half of the most sophisticated and valued territories of the ancient world and, above all, was holding in subjection the Greeks themselves. For these reasons, they were apt to attribute solely to Turkish negligence and depredation the decay and disappearance of classical monuments and to sympathise with the Greeks.

---

[179] Hugh Murray, *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time*, vol. 1, (Longmans:London, 1820), p. vii.
[180] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 191

However, there was more to interest travellers than antiquities. In the course of time, as the circumstances and prospects of the Ottoman Empire declined and it offered, in its decrepitude, an irresistible temptation to the ambitions of all the chief European powers, it appeared to the travellers interesting, important and useful to acquire and bring home correct information and notions about its government and society. Thus, it was "the circumstances of the present moment, which bring them often before us, oblige us to speak of them, and involve the necessity of entertaining some definite sentiments about them,"[181] which induced Newman to undertake the study of the Turks and their empire.

The authors Newman consulted for constructing his study and for arguing his own views and convictions are numerous. They were mostly travellers who had travelled for different reasons through the vast areas of the Ottoman Empire and its provinces, or people who had resided for a couple of years, holding various appointments in Turkey. Among the sources Newman used, there was a lack of writers who concerned themselves with the entire history of the Ottoman Empire and of historians whose primary object was the deep and full study of the Ottoman Empire itself. The only historians Newman managed to use were Herodotus, Thucydides and Gibbon. Apart from Gibbon, who, in his fourth volume dealt with the rise of the Ottoman Empire, Thucydides and Herodotus gave only slight accounts of the early state of the East. Though Newman's work may be not considered a full study of the history of the Ottoman empire, such works would have been useful. Newman

---

[181] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 159

might have used, for example, *The History of the Growth and Decay of the Ottoman Empire* by Demetrius Cantemir, the Greek prince of Moldavia, which contains authentic information composed from the annals of the original Turkish historians; or the *Tableau Général de l'empire Ottoman* by Chevalier D'Ohsson, an Armenian writer born in Turkey, which was considered a correct account of the customs and manners of the Turkish nation; or other distinguished historians such as: Baron De Tott, Rycaut, W. Eton, W. M. Leake, Pouqueville, Savage, J. Hammer, H. Lemaire etc. Newman was conscious of his "defective acquaintance with historical works and travels, and the unreality of book-acknowledge altogether in questions of fact."[182] However, it will be worthwhile to examine the authors he did make use of: Gibbon, Thornton, Murray, Volney, Henry Formby, John Wood, Charles Fellows, Alexander Dow, William Robertson, Richard Chandler, William F. Lynch, Horatio Southgate etc.

The influence of **Edward Gibbon** on Newman in his writings on Christian antiquity is today well understood by modern historians. The peculiar quality of his thought made Newman rely also on his accounts when dealing with the history of the Turks. Moreover "Newman himself freely admitted that he borrowed his history from Gibbon.[183] Gibbon's influence on Newman and the usage Newman made of him is odd as much as justifiable. It is odd because Newman, a pious and zealous Christian made use of an anti-Christian writer. For "Gibbon is famous for his hostility to Christianity,"

---

[182] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. xi

[183] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 48

and it was considered by modern historians as "his most notorious characteristic as a writer."[184] But notwithstanding this view and Gibbon's admiration for the barbarians, Newman, a dogmatic and conservative Christian, who, to some extent favoured civilisation and hated barbarism, availed himself of Gibbon's information and borrowed his history of the Turks from him. In so doing, Newman showed himself a very objective writer. Leaving aside Gibbon's beliefs and attitude towards Christianity, Newman made use of his words and evidence on the barbarous, fanatic and infidel Turks. Such cases were not few in his writings. In general, as Pattison showed, it was Newman's characteristic "to adopt an enemy's vocabulary."[185] Wishing to reach his aim, that is, to influence British public opinion, Newman did not hesitate to make use of his opponents' arguments.

Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* was useful and Newman made use of his accounts on the early state and character of the Scythian or Tartar tribes. However, the final volume of his six-volume work, which is considered "far superior to anything previously written on the subject in English,"[186] described also the history of the rise and development of the Ottoman Empire. Newman seems to have widely used Gibbon's accounts of the early history of the Turks and intentionally to have left those of the latter history of them. Gibbon, in fact, described those tribes as he found them described by the Roman historians and population who came into

---

[184] David Womersley in Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Routledge: Thoemmes Press, 1997), p. xv.
[185] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 54
[186] Harold Bowen, *British Contributions to Turkish Studies* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945), p. 28

contact with them. He spoke of them as being in their early history of development "rude savages of the north…, the most despised portion of the slaves of the great khan of the Geougen…, ignorant" and their unwritten laws as being "rigorous and impartial."[187]

The most complete and reliable accounts on the contemporary state of the Ottoman Empire and its society, Newman found in **Thomas Thornton**'s work, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807). Thornton lived for fourteen years in the British factory at Constantinople and for about fifteen months at Odessa on the coast of the Black Sea. Placed in favourable circumstances and well acquainted with the Turkish language, as the author himself asserted, which other travellers before him were generally not, Thornton undertook the task of acquiring more accurate information on the contemporary state of the Ottoman Empire. Finding "the general appearances of nature," and, more so, "the manners of the inhabitants … so exceedingly different from those to which I had been familiarised,"[188] he analysed and presented general views of his own and many other previous writers on the manners, arts, government, constitution, finances, national character, habits, morals and religion of the Turks. His work was considered a particularly thorough and reliable survey.[189]

---

[187] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Routledge: Thoemmes Press, 1997), pp. 225-231

[188] Thomas Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807), pp. vii-viii

[189] Harold Bowen, *British Contribution to Turkish Studies* (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945), p. 33

Pretending to have been "impartial" in his observations and judgements, he presented with "greater accuracy"[190] the reality of the Turkish life and the Ottoman state. He also claimed that his impartiality allowed him to understand that foreign writers, when treating the nature of Turkish life, because what they found was mostly "contradictory" to their own familiar usages, were inclined to regard with contempt the conditions in Turkey. They mostly ran to "extremes" and "described them as universally savage and barbarous."[191] Certainly, as many writers did, Thornton would not miss the case to present his own work much better than others, though his work does not seem to be much better than what went before. He was slightly disposed towards the Turks.

He found no other name than that of 'despotism' to distinguish the Turkish government. On the other hand, he perceived it as "unfair" to conclude that "because we characterize the Turkish government as a despotism, from an examination both of its nature and principle, we should therefore admit all its possible atrocities as really existing in practise."[192] He pointed out that "the national character of the Turks is indeed a composition of contradictory qualities."[193] He acknowledged that under certain circumstances, they exhibited their bravery, delicacy and sensuality, their sense of humanity, beneficence and hospitality, their friendly reception of the foreigners, as much as under other circumstances, they could exhibit the opposite of them.[194] "But

---

[190] Thomas Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807), p. v
[191] Ibid., p. 3
[192] Ibid., p. 40
[193] Ibid., p. 4
[194] Ibid.

what is this," Newman noted to oppose Thornton, "but to say in one word that we find them barbarians?" Was not their inconsistency, which even Thornton who favoured them made evident, "a sign of their barbarism."[195] It is true, Newman affirmed, that they exhibited distinct moods of their character, which often impressed and surprised the traveller, but it should not be forgotten that "whatever be the natural excellences of the Turks, progressive they are not."[196]

Unlike many other writers, Thornton believed in the introduction of reforms among the Turks, as the only way of placing them in the direction of civilisation. He understood that some would be inconsistent with their habits and suggested: "Let their religion and their customs remain unchanged, let them but be taught principles, to correct and methodise what they already know, and the great work of civilization is performed."[197] All that was necessary, Thornton believed, was to give them instructions and improve them in their own way of life, thus setting them in motion by foreign assistance. Though he had a long familiarity with Turks' usages and much experience in their way of life, Thornton was certainly not blind to their shortcomings and moods of character, which he so openly brought out in his work.

Another preferred writer on whose accounts Newman relied was the French traveller, **Constantin Francois de Volney**. Though his observations were of a much earlier time, his work, *Travels Through Syria and Egypt in the years 1783, 1784 and*

---

[195] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 186
[196] Ibid., p. 187
[197] Thomas Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807), p. 20

1785 (London, 1787), contained useful information on the natural environment and political state of those countries. The topics with which Volney occupied his mind were mainly the political and moral state of those countries and their internal government and social life, with the aim of forming a just estimate of the real power and resources of the Ottoman Empire in those provinces and the whole empire. He possessed means, like sufficient time and knowledge of the native languages, which he considered necessary to appreciate the genius and the character of a nation.[198] Thornton defined him "a speculative political writer."[199] However, he claimed to write inductively. He had not "described countries as more beautiful than they appeared to me; I have not represented their inhabitants more virtuous, nor more wicked than I found them."[200] Impressed by the great differences that existed in the constitution, administration and governance of those provinces by the Turkish rulers, from those of Europe, Volney was led to believe that those subject people could never shake off that yoke.

Like Newman, he did not have any sympathy for the Turks. He considered and defined them as 'barbarians' and their system of governance as 'an ignorant military despotism.'[201] Like Newman, Volney emphasized the influence of nature and climate on the character of the people. It is from Volney`s detailed accounts, though not only

---

[198] Constantin Francois Volney, *Travels through Syria and Egypt in the years 1783*, *1784, and 1785*, vol. 1, (London, 1787), p. v

[199] Thomas Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807), p. 81

[200] Constantin Francois Volney, *Travels through Syria and Egypt in the years 1783*, *1784, and 1785*, vol. 1, (London, 1787), p. vi.

[201] Ibid., pp. 167, 106

from him, that Newman came to perceive the character of the Turks as 'barbarous.' Though they came to develop to a higher level than the Tartar tribes, Volney pointed out, the Turks still preserved those fierce barbarous features of the Tartar in their national character and their empire.[202] Newman frankly supported Volney in this view:

> I am not insensible. I wish to do justice to the high qualities of the Turkish race. I do not altogether deny to its national character the grandeur, the force and originality, the valour, the truthfulness and sense of justice, the sobriety and gentleness, which historians and travellers speak of; but, in spite of all that has been done for them by nature and by the European world, Tartar still is the staple of their composition."[203]

Though Newman, in a few cases, acknowledged some good qualities of the Turkish character, which the travellers made evident in their accounts, in general, he did not choose to be seen and understood as speaking well of the Turks. He even told his audience that: "if I have seemed here or elsewhere in these lectures to speak of them with interest or admiration, only take me Gentlemen as giving the external view of the Turkish history…"[204] But it is not only that. In general Newman's language is such as to allow the reader to understand that he is wholly negative in his view of the Turks. Though much of the general view Volney exhibited in his work is also to be found in many later travellers, the extensive observations, the abundant information, and certainly the compatibility of his views with his own, attracted Newman to Volney`s accounts.

Hugh Murray was another author whose narratives Newman selected to use.

---

[202] Constantin Francois Volney, *Travels through Syria and Egypt in the years 1783*, *1784, and 1785*, vol. 1, (London, 1787), pp. 167, 185
[203] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 110.
[204] Ibid., p. 97

It is not only the subject, but also the character of his work, *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time* (Edinburgh, 1820) that attracted Newman to his accounts. Because, at the time of his writing, Asia was the object of so much interest and curiosity, and so the subject of so many travellers' accounts, Murray undertook the task of bringing together the more important narratives of the previous explorations, made over the larger part of Asia. His primary object was to exhibit "the great machine of Asiatic society in movement and action."[205] Thus, a concise description of the most important European embassies, missions and discoveries from the earliest times to that of Murray's writing, and an abridgement of the most widely accepted views on the East, was certainly a very useful source for Newman's work.

What is common in this abridgement of accounts is that all those who undertook to the early exploration of Asia found it in possession of roving barbarians, who were furious, unjust, and who lived like beasts and resembled them. They were described as possessing a savage cruelty and rude and ferocious habits. They were without faith or religion and they seemed to have been viewed with no small portion of dread and horror. They were described as "destroyers of mankind" and associated with "the most dreadful calamities to which the human race is liable,"[206] due to the great devastations they brought to Europe and Asia. In short, Murray's work showed that they, in general, might be treated as if they belonged to the brute creation, who

---

[205] Hugh Murray, *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time,* vol. 1, (Edinburgh: Longmans, 1820), p. x
[206] Ibid., pp. 71-72.

have ever been the horror of Europe, and as such, as they were the refuse of mankind.

Another voice among those travellers who concerned themselves with the Turks' character and manners in the contemporary period was the English traveller, **Charles Fellows**. He undertook a tour in Asia Minor and precisely in the interior and southern district of the country, which, as he reported, until 1838, the year of his travelling, had not before been traversed by any European.[207] His work, *A Journal Written During An Excursion in Asia Minor* (London, 1839), contains not only useful physical descriptions of the country and especially of the remains of ancient cities and architecture, but also some interesting notes on the people and their customs.

Though "at the time of my arrival in the country," Fellows remarked, "I was strongly biased in favour of the Greeks, and equally prejudiced against the Turks," in the course of his narrative, he draws the attention of the reader and shows how much his "unfavourable idea of the Turkish character was gradually removed by a personal intimacy with the people, generally in situations where they were remote from every restraint."[208] Instead of what he expected, as he confessed, he found taciturnity and dignified appearance, sociability, hospitality and kindness to strangers, entire devotion to religion, which regulated all their civil relations and duties, and honesty, truth and honour.[209] It was this last attitude towards the Turks and the character of his work itself in favour of the Turks that led Newman to define him as "the panegyrist both of

---

[207] Charles Fellows, *A Journal Written During An Excursion in Asia Minor* (John Murray: London, 1839), p. 2
[208] Ibid., p. v
[209] Ibid., pp. 294-297

Mahmood and his people."[210] Fellows certainly had his own reasons for writing in favour of the Turks. And the following passage expresses better his view and intention:

> How different are now my feelings towards the Turks, from those uncharitable prejudices with which I looked upon them… To their manners, habits, and character, equally as to their costume, I am become not only reconciled, but sincerely attached; for I have found truth, honesty and kindness, the most estimable and amiable qualities, in a people among whom I so little looked for them.[211]

Thus, it is clear that Fellows took it as his task to undo the 'prevailing prejudices' against the Turks (as he viewed some of the previous writers' opinion and attitudes towards the Turks), and to paint a favourable picture of the Turks. The entire submission of the Turks to the Divine Will, their fair treatment of the brute creation, resulting in the absence of fear in all birds and beasts, the natural delicacy of all their customs and their truth, honesty and kindness were sufficient, Fellows thought and remarked, to exculpate the Turks from the misrepresented charges of fatalism, cruelty and immorality.[212]

But despite these remarkable natural excellences, which indeed were noted by later travellers and by Newman as well, Fellows recorded another consideration. But, such negative passages, being isolated in his work, do not refute his favourable tone towards the Turks. Of this Newman made much in his study:

---

[210] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 195
[211] Charles Fellows, *A Journal Written During An Excursion in Asia Minor* (John Murray: London, 1839), p. 294
[212] Ibid., pp. 296-297

> My intimacy with the character of the Turks, which had led me to think so highly of their moral excellence, has not given me the same favourable impression of the development of their mental powers. Their refinement is of the manners and affections; there is little cultivation or activity of mind among them.[213]

It is just this view of the Turks as unable to develop and progress that Newman strongly raised in his work as a very important element which should be considered when treating the issue of 'civilisation' among the Turks. Wishing to influence British public opinion Newman selected to use those images and opinions that he thought likely to stir emotion and such a consideration given even by a Turcophile writer better than anything else seems to corroborate Newman's main purpose.

Among the few of those travellers who acknowledged some good features and kindly feelings in the character of the Turks, was also the English traveller, **John Wood**. In his work, *A personal Narrative of a Journey to the Source of the River Oxus: by the route of the Indus, Kabul and Badakhshan*, Wood gave a slight sketch of his journeys in Afghanistan, a region little visited by Europeans, in the years 1836, 1837, and 1838. Wood found in those regions many tribes of Tartar origin, such as the Uzbeks who practised the Muslim religion. As his journeys were in "a poor, cold and unpromising country," which "being chiefly Mohammedans, differed little in their manners and customs from their brethren of the same creed"[214] in other nations, Newman found some useful information in Wood`s narratives for arguing his

---

[213] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 187

[214] John Wood, *A personal Narrative of a Journey to the Source of the River Oxus: By the Route of the Indus, Kabul and Badakhshan* (John Murray: London, 1841), p. vi

convictions.

Like Fellows though, Wood showed how greatly he had modified his unfavourable opinion of the Eastern countries' inhabitants. His more intimate acquaintance with them, as he confessed, seems to have taught him "to dissent from those wholesale terms of abuse which Europeans too often lavish on the native population."[215] He believed that better acquaintance with those people would bring less talk in travellers' accounts of barbarism and ignorance.[216] Wood found religion there as a bond of society, which "knits them as it were into a general fraternity, in which every member, rich or poor, is, though a stranger, always affectionately received."[217] He was greatly impressed by the kindly feeling of the Mohammedans, who, though they "looked upon Christians in the light of benighted and misguided men," received them courteously and treated with kindness and respect as being 'people of the Book' entitled to the commiseration of the faithful from the sacred character of Isau (Jesus).[218]

This issue of the Turks' attitude towards the Christians was frequently touched on by other travellers, who seem to voice various and discordant opinions. While some travellers attested the "scorn and hatred" of the Turks towards the Christians, which opinion Newman adopted and supported, there were others, who pretending to view things more attentively because they were more acquainted and

---

[215] John Wood, *A personal Narrative of a Journey to the Source of the River Oxus: By the Route of the Indus, Kabul and Badakhshan* (John Murray: London, 1841), p. 228
[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid., p. 148
[218] Ibid., pp. 148-149

familiarised with the Turks' behavior, expressed a different and opposite opinion. In this last group of writers, we may include Fellows, Wood and to some extent Thornton.

Thornton, for example, who pretends to have observed cautiously and closely the behaviour of the Turks in relation to the Christians, distinguished and witnessed their different behaviour towards their brethren and towards Christians by asserting that: "the Mussulmans, courteous and humane in their intercourse with each other, sternly refuse to unbelievers the salutation of peace," in the sense that "believers recognize each other by the benediction… *selam aleykum*, the peace of God be upon thee; but they reply to the civilities of an unbeliever by the polite and charitable expression, *ahbetin hayr ola*, may the end be happy."[219] It is true, Thornton asserted, that "the common people, more bigoted to their dogmas, express more bluntly their sense of superiority over the Christians," (an observation which Newman used in his work, leaving intentionally the following part of the sentence out, as it would not fit to his own view of the Turks' "scorn and hatred of us"), "but it is false that even they, return the address of a Christian with insult."[220]

Fellows is an earnest witness for their amiableness, says Newman, but he does not conceal that the children "hoot after a European, and call him Frank dog, and even strike him."[221] Though Newman acknowledged Fellows as being in favour of the

---

[219] Thomas Thornton, *The Present State of Turkey: A Description of the Political, Civil and Religious Constitution, Government and Laws of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1807), p. 301
[220] Ibid.
[221] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 205

Turks, he again does not miss the opportunity of making good use of the concessions of his opponents.

Hugh Murray, while giving in his work travellers' accounts which mention the cries like 'infidel dog' used among the Turks, concluded like this his discussion of the issue: "Their hatred towards Christians is deep; but is it deeper than in Spain and Portugal is felt towards Turks or even Protestants, who are constantly saluted with the appellation of Moro! Barbaro! Bruto!"[222]

From all these various and contradictory records one thing is clear. There was a time in mid-nineteenth century England when religious feelings and even religious hostility among people of different creeds were very intense. It is in this context that the discussion on the attitude of the Turks towards the Christians should be seen and understood. Some writers' assertions that there was no contempt and unfair attitude of the Turks towards the Christians may have been just a simple propaganda, while Murray's assertion seems more right and meaningful.

Richard Chandler's work, *Travels in Asia Minor: 1764-65*, published in 1775, referred to a journey undertaken at the instigation and under the instructions of the Society of Dilettanti. Chandler's object was the exploration of antiquities and as such, his observations on the people he saw, their religious customs and local superstitions, and of the places he visited are slight. He mostly showed the state of the ruins of antique monuments and the desolation and frequent ravages that the country

---

[222] Hugh Murray, *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time,* vol. 1, (Edinburgh: Longmans, 1820), p. 413

had undergone from the Turks as they extended their conquests. Frequently in his work, a general want of cordiality towards them and his view that the Turks possessed a ferocious character were made evident. But, in general, his remarks seem superficial. The author was not seriously engaged in observing such things, as his object was the recording of ancient sites. Newman quoted him but little.

Horatio Southgate was another traveller consulted by Newman. His work, *Narrative of a Tour Through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopotamia: With Observations on the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries* was the result of a mission performed under the direction of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States in 1836. Southgate's object was the observation of the present character and conditions of Mohammedanism and the significance of this for the advancement of Christianity in those regions. Thus his work was a good source on the actual moral and religious state of the inhabitants of those regions, though Newman did not make much use of it. He used it only to argue his view that even in their religion, the Turks "have but remained as they were."[223] Taking the idea from Southgate, who brought many proofs of the decay of the spirit of Islam in those areas, one of which was the absence of religious controversy among the Muslims, Newman developed it further. He revealed that it was the Turks' apathy, a characteristic of their national temperament, which among others brought the decay of their religion.[224] Though greatly devoted to their religion, Newman pointed out, it

---

[223] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 211
[224] Ibid., p. 210

"owes nothing to them; it is not only in substance, but in concrete shape, just what it was when it came to them."[225] It is evident here, and even interesting that believing in the theological doctrine or the principle of development in dogma, for which he was most famous, Newman not only thought it true of non-Christian religions, but he also looked for it in them. For Newman thought that the future of a civilisation depends on a theological notion of dogma and belief, he looked for it in their Muslim religion. And instead of progress and development, he found apathy and decay in the spirit of Islam.

Apart from religious matters, which were fairly and in a very detailed way discussed and related by Southgate, there were many other interesting and valuable pieces of information in his work, which were not used by Newman, such as the differences between Oriental and Occidental manners, the reception of new reforms and innovations by the Turkish common people, etc.

Thus, an analysis of Newman's sources and of the way he used them leads us to the conclusion that Newman's intention in writing on the Turks was not to produce a full study of the history of the Ottoman empire. He not only took an 'external' view of Turkish history, one which could be comprehended by the general public, which he was seeking to influence, but, he himself was conscious of his "defective acquaintance with historical works and travels, and the unreality of book-acknowledge." Therefore, he completely based his history of the Turks on the accounts of other men and

---

[225] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 210

authorities. Moreover, Newman himself stated that his intention was "to group old facts and materials in his own way", that is, to reconstruct Turkish history according to his own view and conviction using only those eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century writers' accounts that he thought better to corroborate his main view of the Turks. Thus, the compatibility of his sources' view with his own was his main criterion in selecting the sources.

In the list of Newman's sources, we also noted that there was a lack of writers and historians whose primary object was the deep and full study of the Ottoman empire itself. We remarked that in his work there were no few cases when Newman referred to writers whose records had only slight information useful for Newman's purposes such as Chandler's, Thirlwall's, Mitford's, Meyendorff's, Moorcroft's and Elphinstone's accounts or when Newman intentionally refused to use other useful arguments from them as they would not fit to his own view and conviction. Thus, as we showed, it was Newman's defective acquaintance with historical sources and his criterion of compatibility which made him borrow long passages and phrases from the sources he consulted. But, notwithstanding these defects of Newman's usage of the sources, he appears to have made every attempt to present himself an objective writer. Wishing to reach his purpose, that is, to influence British public on foreign policy towards the Muslim Turks, Newman freely made use of his opponents' arguments, such as those of Gibbon, Fellows and Wood.

In general, the list of books, reports and travellers' accounts and descriptions, written by Englishmen and other Europeans on Turkey and Turkish affairs was huge;

the accounts of information they contained were vast, various and discordant. Opinions either pro-Russian or pro-Turk existed everywhere, though there were many who regretted the Turkish reforms, condemned the Ottoman government, but commended the Turkish people.

It also should be noted that for various reasons, Turkey and the Turks aroused passionate feelings in those who had written about them. Variations in attitude seem to have been the result of the discoveries of new facts about Turkish reality and of passionate feelings which varied according to the Anglo-Turkish relations. Among the many reports and pieces of information brought home, exaggerated denunciation and indignant defence were to stand side by side. Harsh words, contempt and distrust were to be answered by emphasizing Turkish magnificence, courtesy and charm.

But, a close observation of the general outlook and the manner in which foreigners regarded the Turks and their empire leaves the impression that apart from the new information brought home and the passionate feelings among the English, most of the various views and opinions arose from the obstacles that existed between the Europeans and Turks. One of them was the religious feeling. "In the eyes of Christendom Islam and Judaism had for centuries embodied the perversity of unbelief…," Bowen remarked, "while the Reformation had tended to make them take differences of religious opinion more than ever to heart."[226] It is in this framework that Newman`s work on the Turks should be understood. As a religious personality and, above all as a Catholic, he strongly held, as we showed in the previous chapter, that because Christianity was synonymous

---

[226] Harold Bowen, *British Contribution to Turkish Studies* (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945), p. 12

with civilisation and the Turks were not Christians, the Turks had to be barbarous.[227] What Newman despised was Islam, a religion which denied the Trinity and possessed a great political power, which Newman wished the Christians to have. He even sought zealously to have that power given to them. It is in this context that his work should be seen. Newman himself did not hate Turks as a nation. Unlike many writers of his time, who for different reasons wrote for or against the Turks, Newman himself did not have "any special interest in them for their own sake."[228] His work was not "a work of racial hatred,"[229] as Pattison alleged, influenced by the harsh language Newman used in his work. His work was a work the purpose of which was to influence British public opinion on foreign policy. It was an open expression of Newman's distrust of the Turks. Above all, it showed his interest in those political matters which bore on the fortunes of the Church, his great devotion to the interests of the Church and of religion. Newman's view of the Turks belonged to that small party of British society, which far from paying attention to momentary British political interests and current Anglo-Turkish relations, regarded the Turks as incapable of progress and civilisation. Though, to some considerable extent, he was influenced by the nineteenth-century Orientalist view of the Turks, which the sources he made use of held, his primary object was not to write against the Turks. In fact, it was his defective knowledge of historical sources which allowed him to make use of sources he might otherwise have been very critical of.

---

[227] For a detailed discussion of the issue see pp. 56-59 of this study.
[228] John Henry Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. 1, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. 159
[229] Robert Pattison, The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 180

Apart from religion, another obstacle or difficulty for foreigners attempting to understand the Ottoman Empire was their unfamiliarity with the nature of the country and the manners of its inhabitants, which required a long period of stay. From their accounts it is quite evident that many of the travellers knew little of what they were talking about, because they confronted with a new and very different reality from that of their own. To understand and know that almost unknown reality they strongly felt the necessity of daily and intimate intercourse with the people they were studying. Southgate, for example, expressed like this the importance of such an intercourse:

> At the end of my first month's residence in Constantinople, I might have promulgated my opinions on Turkish institutions and customs with the utmost confidence. At the end of three months, I began to perceive the fallacy of most of my conclusions, and when six month had passed, I found that I knew next to nothing of the object of my study.

To reach an effective intercourse with the population of those regions, Southgate continued, "I was compelled… to throw myself among the people, and to retire as much as possible from the influence of Western associations, by departing from Western habits and society."[230] Having gained a good acquaintance with Turkish life and seeing everything up close, foreign travellers were inclined to deplore not only the ignorance of the Turks, but also their inability of making progress and of accepting and holding to modern civilisation. It is for emphasizing just this last view that Newman, in the main, based his work on those writers, whose accounts corroborated

---

[230] Horatio Southgate, *Narrative of a Tour Through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopotamia: With Observations on the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1840), p. 66

better his own view of the Turks as incapable of civilisation.

Thus, in that multitude and variety of opinions, as there happened to be at that time, Bowen noted, "very few learned Englishmen have applied themselves to a study of Turkey, the Turks, the Turkish language, and Turkish literature." It is not surprising, he continued, that "on the whole the less learned works are the more informative. The writers that have taken the general history of Turkey as their theme have been content on the whole to adopt the views of their predecessors."[231] In the light of contemporary European studies on the Turks and their Ottoman empire, where the obstacles or the difficulties of religious feelings, of the many differences in the mode of life, and of an unfamiliarity and small acquaintance with the manners and life of a very different reality were felt, Newman's work and his attitude towards the Turks should be generously understood. Above all, Newman's defective knowledge of historical sources and the character of those sources he used was such as to strengthen his convictions and opinions about the Turks. Though in some cases Newman acknowledged what was good and worthy in the character of the Turks, he considered these as insufficient and unable to bring Turkey to cope with other civilised European countries and even to change his own conviction that the Turkish power was not a civilised, but a barbarous one.

---

[231] Harold Bowen, *British Contribution to Turkish Studies* (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945), pp. 8, 63

C O N C L U S I O N

This study undertook to analyse Newman`s anti-Turkish attitude on the Crimean War. In constructing a short biography of Newman until the time of the Crimean War, it introduced the intellectual background and sources of Newman`s thought. We looked at the nature and peculiarities of that thought. These showed that Newman developed in his personality a union between fidelity to God and intellectual integrity.

The various philosophical influences, under which his mind developed, and his love for the patristic writings, the classics and the ancient Fathers, developed in him a peculiar personal standpoint. Soon Newman understood that his English Church, under the influence of liberal ideas spreading from the French Revolution, was failing more and more to maintain its Catholic heritage, its historical and theological insights. For him, the religious and political liberalism of his own day was carrying his country against the faith, against Catholic truth. Liberalism, as he conceived it, was driving his country in the direction of unbelief. As a defender of faith, Newman undertook the duty of resisting the liberal spirit of his age and of rescuing his Church from the anti-dogmatic principle of Liberalism. To accomplish that Newman sought to strengthen the apostolic nature of the Church of England and its divine authority and to enforce the principle of dogma.

Because he understood and believed that dogma was the “backbone of religion,” faith, belief and dogma became the key-terms of his thought. But

Newman`s interest and dedication to dogma and faith, to tradition and Christian orthodoxy, led some historians view him as very hostile to progress and indifferent to civilisation and his philosophy as an "indictment of the modern spirit."[232] To show that this definition of Newman was not entirely right, this study analysed Newman`s writings on the Turks and the Ottoman Empire. For it was in these writings, that Newman displayed his own theory of 'civilisation'. Unlike his view of civilisation based on 'belief' and 'dogma', so dear to Newman, in it he introduced a theory of civilisation based on the notions of 'progress' and 'knowledge'. We showed that it was true that Newman sometimes had various opinions or "dual allegiances," as Pattison[233] noted. But, we cannot deny that he favoured progress and civilisation, as his study of the history of the Turks, based precisely on this principle, shows. At least, when dealing with their history and their future, or rather, with the current British foreign policy towards Turkey, Newman clearly favoured 'civilisation.' Based on the principles of progress and civilisation, and to some extent influenced by nineteenth-century Orientalist and secularist view of the Turks, Newman revealed that the Muslim Turks were not only "the inveterate and hateful enemy of the Cross," but also that the Ottoman state and its society were uncivilised, barbarous and un-progressive. Newman sought to show his countrymen that for these reasons, it was unworthy and unwise to wage a war in support of Muslim Turkey and to oppose the cause of a Christian power.

---

[232] Robert Pattison, *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 188
[233] Ibid., p. 184

Newman availed himself of the information supplied by many British and other European writers and travellers. It was these accounts which showed that Newman was not alone in his thought and opinions about the Turks. For this reason the study analysed the sources Newman consulted. Newman may be found interesting in his unoriginality. The nature and character of nineteenth-century British historiography on the Turks and the Ottoman Empire was such as to strengthen Newman`s convictions and views and to show how much Newman`s thought stood in the context of the nineteenth-century British thought in general.

To offer a conclusion to the present study, we may say that, though Newman`s work, *The History of the Turks in their Relation to Europe*, has been generally neglected by the historians, it is a valuable source for understanding Newman`s thought and it offers a corrective to some judgements which have been made of him.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Chandler, Richard. *Travels in Asia Minor: 1764-1765* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1971)

Fellows, Charles. *A Journal Written During an Excursion in Asia Minor* (London, 1839)

Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 6 vol., (Routledge: Thoemmes Press, 1997)

Newman, John Henry. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua: Being a History of his Religious Opinions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990)

Newman, John Henry. *Autobiographical Writings,* ed. Henry Tristram (London and New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956)

Newman, John Henry. *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1907)

Newman, John Henry. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Charles Stephen Dessain, vol.ii, (Oxford, 1978-1984)

Newman, John Henry. *Historical Sketches*, vol. i, (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908)

Murray, Hugh. *Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Asia: From the Earliest Ages to the Present Time*, vol. i, (Edinburgh: Longmans, 1820)

Southgate, Horatio. *Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopotamia: With Observations on the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries,* vol. i, (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1840)

Thornton, Thomas. *The Present State of Turkey* (London, 1807)

Volney, Constantin Francois. *Travels through Syria and Egypt in the years 1783, 1784, and 1785*, vol. i, (London, 1787)

Wood, John. *A Personal Narrative of a Journey to the Source of the River Oxus: By the Route of the Indus, Kabul and Badakhshan* (London: John Murray, 1841)

Secondary Sources

Achten, Rik. *First Principles and Our Way to Faith: A Fundamental-Theological Study of John Henry Newman`s Notion of First Principles* (Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, Bern, New York, Paris, Wien: Lang, 1995)

Bailey, Frank Edgar. *British Policy and the Turkish Reform Movement: A Study in Anglo-Turkish Relations, 1826-1853* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942)

Bourne, Kenneth. *The Foreign Policy of Victorian England, 1830-1902* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970)

Bowen, Harold. *British Contributions to Turkish Studies* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945)

Chadwick, Owen. *The Victorian Church, Part 1: 1829-1859* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1992)

Chadwick, Owen. *Newman* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Chamberlain, Muriel E. *'Pax Britannica'?: British Foreign Policy, 1789-1914* (London and New York: Longmans, 1993)

Gleason, John Howes. *The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain: A Study in the Interaction of Policy and Opinion* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950)

Ker, Ian. *John Henry Newman: A Biography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)

Lowe, Norman. *Mastering Modern British History* (Macmillan, 1989)

Marriot, J. A. R. *The Eastern Question: A Historical Study in European Diplomacy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Neale, John. *The Age of Catherine de Medici* (London, 1951)

Pattison, Robert. *The Great Dissent: John Henry Newman and the Liberal Heresy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)

Reed, John Shelton. *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Nashville & London: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996)

Rich, Norman. *Why the Crimean War?: A Cautionary Tale(Mc. Grow-Hill Inc., 1991)*

Saab, Ann Pottinger. *The Origins of Crimean Alliance* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1977)

Sources from Internet

- http://www.newadvent.org/

Barry, William. *The Oxford Movement (1833-1845)*, transcribed by A. Waterman.

- http://www.history.swt.edu/

O'Connell, Marvin R. *Freedom and Conversion: The English Experience*. Journal of Texas Catholic History and Culture, 1993

- http://www.catholic.net/

Whitehead, Kenneth D. Newman Against Liberalism.

- http://www.newmanreader.org/

Ward, Wilfrid. *The Life of John Henry Newman,* vol. i, (Longmans, Green & Co., 1912)